DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 987 TM 006 548

TITLE Title I ESEA Projects: Digest of Annual Evaluations 1965-1976. Report No. 7681.

INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.

PUB DATE Mar 76

NOTE 126p.; For related document, see ED 113 385

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Annual Reports; Basic Skills; *Compensatory Education Programs; Computer Assisted Instruction; Counseling Services; Creative Dramatics; Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary School Science; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Evaluation Methods; *Federal Programs; Mathematics; *Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; Summer Programs; World Affairs

IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); *Philadelphia School District PA

ABSTRACT

The major portion of this digest consists of brief descriptions of currently funded Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I projects in the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania public school system, from 1965 through 1976. Each description includes four sections: management information, project description, evaluation techniques and major findings on a year-by-year basis through January 1976. Preliminary findings are offered for the 1975-1976 school year. A list of 41 projects no longer funded under Title I appears in the Appendix. (MV)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144987

DEPARTMENT OF FEDERAL
EVALUATION RESOURCE SERVICES
IM006 548

TITLE I ESEA PROJECTS

Digest of Annual Evaluations

1965-1976

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

The School District of Philadelphia

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Report #7681

TITLE I ESEA PROJECTS:

DIGEST OF ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

1965 - 1976

A historical summary, by the Department of Federal Evaluation Resource Services, of the key findings reported in the annual evaluations of each project.

March 1976

Office of Research and Evaluation

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Superintendent of Schools
Michael P. Marcase

Executive Deputy Superintendent
Robert L. Poindexter

Deputy Superintendent for School Services
David A. Horowitz

Executive Director, Office of Federal Programs
Thomas C. Rosica

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Arthur W. Thomas, President
Dolores Oberholtzer, Vice-President

Augustus Baxter	George Hutt
Tobyann Boonin	Robert M. Sebastian
Philip Davidoff	Felice Stack

George Philip Stahl, Jr.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Michael H. Kean, Executive Director
Research and Evaluation

Stephen H. Davidoff, Assistant Director
Federal Evaluation Resource Services

This report was prepared by the Department of Federal Evaluation Resource Services. Assistance in evaluation design, instrument development, data analysis, and editorial matters was provided by the Division of Instructional Research and Development Services, Edward K. Brown, Director. Members of the project-evaluation teams are named in the respective project reports. In most cases, project were assigned to teams under the leadership of research associates; in every case, the team leader is named first. If major responsibility within a team was assigned to an individual, that person's name is marked with an asterisk (*).

Projects included in this report were funded under Title I, ESEA, and administered through the Office of Federal Programs, Thomas C. Rosica, Executive Director

SUMMARY

1965-1975

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the largest federal aid-to-education program, was passed in 1965. Title I provides financial assistance to local school districts that plan and operate special programs for educationally deprived children in target-area schools. It is a supplementary program designed to upgrade the educational opportunities of disadvantaged children.

Compensatory education is based upon the assumption that supplementary services can ameliorate low achievement levels commonly found in target schools. An increase in scholastic achievement is intended to result from compensating pupils with increased instructional services. A variety of materials are used in conjunction with instructional settings, encouraging the consideration of individual pupils' difficulties. The teacher can establish settings in which he or she has better opportunities to diagnose each pupil's achievement level and prescribe tasks which help to eliminate learning deficiencies. Projects funded in the Philadelphia Title I program have established various instructional configurations which are intended to improve the interactions of teachers, pupils, and materials, with the aim of improving rates of educational progress.

In comparing May 1974 and February 1975 nationally-standardized test results, positive findings were reported. The percentage of pupils scoring above the national median rose from 23 to 27 in reading, and from 25 to 28 in mathematics. For the first time since nationally-standardized basic skills testing began in Philadelphia in 1966, more than 45% of pupils in two grades scored above the median for the total battery of tests, with 47% of second-year pupils and 48% of first-year pupils scoring above that point.

At the same time, the proportion of extremely low scores diminished. The percentage of pupils scoring below the 16th percentile (indicating serious academic problems) decreased from 40 to 34 in reading, and from 41 to 35 in mathematics.

Another positive effect of ESEA Title I has been involvement of parents in the educational process. A two-year longitudinal study of the attitudes and perceptions of 5,000 parents of Philadelphia school children was conducted in 1970-1971 and 1971-1972. The findings of that study demonstrate that parents of Title I children (a) are accurately informed about school affairs (including knowledge about Title I projects in their schools), (b) are active participants in school activities, and (c) have positive opinions about their schools.

These levels of parent participation, as published in the School District's annual reports, did not exist prior to 1965.

ESEA Title I funds have also opened the door to many new opportunities. Target-school administrators are learning how to better deploy their staff and material resources to improve pupil achievement. And teachers in their schools are becoming more effective in their methods of diagnosis, individualization, and classroom management.

1975-1976

Individual project reports in this volume include preliminary findings for the current school year. In general, the information is descriptive and based on several hundred observations across the School District over a five-month period. The Title I Observational Checklist and other devices were utilized to systematically gather data from carefully constructed samples of schools. In this way the findings, while tentative, are more generalizable to the entire School District. This information may be used as a guide. It is believed that meaningful decisions may be made at various levels by examining the congruence between project operations and the attainment of stated goals.

The preliminary findings for the current school year are not intended as a summative evaluation of any project. Summative evaluation findings will be included in the annual report, EVALUATION OF TITLE I ESEA PROJECTS, to be published after the close of the current school year.

-- Stephen H. Davidoff

CONTENTS

Summary iii

Digest of Project Evaluations

Activity-Centered Mathematics for Retarded Educable Children--See Comprehensive Mathematics Project
Affective Education 1
Aide Services--See Comprehensive Reading Project
Alternative Programs (ESEA Title I Component) 5
Benchmark 9
Bilingual Education 11
Classroom Aides--See Aide Services "A"
Comprehensive Mathematics Project
A. Elementary Mathematics Resource Teacher 15
B. Junior High/Middle School Mathematics Specialist 17
C. Senior High School Mathematics Specialists and Skill Centers 19
D. Activity-Centered Mathematics for Retarded Educable Children 21
Comprehensive Reading Project 23
Aide Services 25
District 1 Reading 31
District 2 Reading 33
District 3 Reading 35
District 4 Reading 37
District 5 Reading 39
District 6 Reading 41
District 7 Reading 43
Improvement of Reading Skills "A" and "B" 45
Improvement of Reading Skills "C" 49
Individualized Education Center 51
Intensive Reading for Secondary Students 53
Language Arts Reading Camps 55
Operation Individual 59
Primary Reading Skills Centers 61
Reading Improvement through Teacher Education 65
Summer Reading Readiness 67
Computer-Managed Instruction 69
Counseling Services 73
Creative Dramatics 77
District Reading Projects--See Comprehensive Reading Project
Education in World Affairs 81

Elementary Mathematics Resource Teacher--See Comprehensive Mathematics Project
English as a Second Language--Readiness *85*
English to Speakers of Other Languages *87*
Episcopal Academy: Summer Enrichment *91*
Follow Through (ESEA Title I Component) *93*
Improvement of Reading Skills--See Comprehensive Reading Project
Individualized Education Center--See Comprehensive Reading Project
Institutions for Neglected and Delinquent Children *99*
Intensive Reading for Secondary Students--See Comprehensive Reading Project
Junior High/Middle School Mathematics Specialist--See Comprehensive Mathematics Project
Kindergarten Aides--See Aide Services "A"
Language Arts Reading Camps--See Comprehensive Reading Project
Learning Centers *103*
Library Instructional Materials Assistants--See Aide Services "B"
Mathematics Skill Centers, Grades 11 and 12--See Senior High School Mathematics
Mathematics Specialists, Grade 10--See Senior High School Mathematics
Meet the Artist *107*
Motivation *109*
Multimedia Center *113*
Operation Individual--See Comprehensive Reading Project
Out-of-School Sequenced Science Experiences *117*
Parent Aides--See Aide Services "C"
Primary Reading-Skills Centers--See Comprehensive Reading Project
Reading Improvement through Teacher Education--See Comprehensive Reading Project
Reading-Skills Centers--See Improvement of Reading Skills "A"
School-Community Coordinator *121*
Senior High School Mathematics Specialists and Skill Centers--See Comprehensive Mathematics Project
Shared-Time Reading--See Improvement of Reading Skills "B"
Speech and Hearing *125*
Summer Reading Readiness--See Comprehensive Reading Project
Summer Special Education *129*
Walnut Center *131*
Young Audiences *135*

Appendix:

Projects No Longer Funded under Title I *139*

AFFECTIVE EDUCATION

ADMINISTRATOR:	Norman Newberg
HEADQUARTERS:	Room 323, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7776
PBRS CODE:	611-04-611
OPERATING YEARS:	1968-1976
GRADES SERVED:	K-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	15,840
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	42
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 10, Paraprofessional 1, Clerical 1
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $216,000, Summer $16,000, Total $232,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	William E. Loue III, Judith Green Leibovitz, Lisbeth Sorkin

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Affective Education is a K-12 project (AEP) which offers Title I personnel and parents training in the use of specific curricula and specific teaching strategies developed by the project. These curricula and strategies are designed to enhance learning of basic life skills by connecting the school with the students' lives, developing structures for sharing the responsibility for learning, integrating the communication skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, increasing interest in learning and success in school, and improving self-concepts and attitudes toward school. In addition to offering numerous other services, AEP has three major emphases.

The project's teacher-training system--the communications network (CN)--helps teachers to develop in children the basic communication skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The training for first-year participants covers such key factors in learning as the effect of teacher expectations on student performances, the impact of histories of success or failure on the part of students, and promoting a student's inner locus of control. The second-year CN group continues to explore such important learning variables as a child's sense of responsibility for his/her achievement in basic life skills.

Resource services (RS) functions as the dissemination-and-diffusion branch of this project. It uses a variety of tested affective methods and attempts to reach diverse groups of school personnel and parents. These groups work under the direction of an experienced program trainer or staff member by selecting an affective issue and the specific academic content they are interested in studying. The project continues to train parents to fulfill their roles as home teachers capable of aiding their children in acquiring both academic and life skills.

A third aspect of AEP--school for all ages (SFAA)--functions as a developmental model for increasing the age-range of student interactions. AEP provides ongoing

support to educational programs at two school sites emphasizing cross-age and interdependent experiences. There adults from the community may return to school, even to acquire their high school diplomas, and a small number of community adults provide their services to the school in return for a stipend and formal educational experience at a local university.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Curriculum analysis, questionnaires, surveys, observations, and standardized tests.

KEY FINDINGS

1968-1973 Curricula in Affective Education (e.g., urban affairs and communication) were developed. Participating students seemed to use more explicit language in describing their feelings than a control group. Teachers indicated a greater awareness and knowledge of techniques of "process" education than they had before.

No real differences were found in attendance or disciplinary referrals. Patterns were contradictory both across and within schools.

Evaluation conducted by project staff indicated that project teachers used a great variety of techniques and were open to trying new ideas, affective students demonstrated more positive attitudes toward teachers than comparison groups, and affective students and comparison students achieved at the same rate with respect to reading comprehension and knowledge of American history.

Participating teachers reported that they were dealing with disciplinary matters more constructively. Students reported that they felt more positive about school and that they had improved in scholastic achievement. They also indicated that the human relationship/vocational awareness component was of value.

Results of observations and questionnaires indicated that elementary teachers varied their pupil groupings to allow for diverse learning styles, and for displaying behaviors indicating openness in expressing and acknowledging feelings as they influence learning. In the junior high school program, fewer latenesses were recorded among project students. At the School for Human Services, students reported that they felt better about themselves and their teachers, had more control over their learning, and felt more skilled in developing interpersonal relationships. Statistically significant superiority in silent-reading comprehension was found among participants in comparison with non-participants. In addition, approximately 60% of the high school participants had higher English and social studies grades than in previous years.

1973-1974 The needs of teachers, students, and parents have been met by the Affective Education project through the development of new curricula, teacher training and support, development of new classroom organizational structures, and parent training. Specifically, the project was successful in improving student achievement, attendance, and behavior in school, providing short-term teacher and parent training and support, developing new curricula, encouraging frequent use of affective teaching techniques, and planning for the transgenerational school. The project had limited success in long-term teacher training, improvement of student attitudes toward school, and improvement of the students' self-concepts.

1974-1975 The project has had partial success at the secondary level pertaining to student attendance, student attitude toward school, student discipline, and students' ratings of teachers. It was successful in developing new curricula, disseminating information, providing in-service courses, maintaining a resource center, conducting short-term teacher and parent training, encouraging the frequent use of affective teaching techniques, delivering communications-network training, resources, and follow-up, and improving reading levels of third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade students and reading comprehension at the secondary level.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The Affective Education project is fully operational. The resource-services component is providing extensive training to School District personnel and parents as scheduled. The reported number of requests for initial and additional training is extensive. Moreover, the AEP resource center is used frequently by teachers and parents.*

The communications-network training is proceeding as planned. Interest and attendance of teachers are high. Testing of second-year CN teachers' pupils will commence in March. However, the "freeze" on Title I funds for purchasing materials may affect the attainment of the CN objectives.

The training and support for the School for All Ages is proceeding on schedule. Generally, weekly training sessions are provided for each staff, or for both staffs combined.

Each of the project's objectives this year concentrates solely on the academic performances of participating students. This accountability is indicative of the project staff's sincere belief that its teacher-training efforts will directly impact on the academic performance of students.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1:	Barry, Bartram (includes SHS), Belmont, Bryant, Daroff, Dunlap, Harrington, Holmes, Lea, McMichael, Mitchell, Rhoads, Tilden, Wilson
District 2:	Gideon, Meade
District 3:	All Ages
District 4:	Blaine, Blankenburg, Cleveland, Duckrey, Gratz, Heston, Hill, Kenderton, Lehigh, Leidy, Peirce, Pratt-Arnold, Rhodes, Shoemaker, Stanton, Stokley, Strawberry Mansion, Walton, Wright
District 5:	Brown, Jones, Penn Treaty
District 6:	East Falls, Lingelbach
District 7:	All Ages

ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS (ESEA TITLE I COMPONENT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Lorraine Brown
HEADQUARTERS: Room 208, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE: 299-7831
PBRS CODE: 611-03(04)-539
OPERATING YEARS: 1972-1976
GRADES SERVED: 7-12
NO. OF PUPILS: 1,270
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 26
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 43, Paraprofessional 47, Clerical 3
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $901,000, Summer None, Total $901,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Roger J. Fishman, Joseph Wroblewski

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project includes a variety of programs which have typically modeled themselves after open classrooms, schools without walls, minischools, dropout centers, discipline-crisis centers, schools within schools, and schools for students with special problems (gifted learners, academic failures, disruptive pupils, pregnant students). The typical program (a) provides the students and their parents with the freedom to choose between educational options, (b) has a program or curriculum that is significantly different from the conventional or regular program, (c) is a total program, not just a short class or a part of the school day, (d) has a location, whether in a separate building, a wing of a school, a community facility, or a few designated classrooms, so it can be distinguished geographically from the regular school program, (e) clearly defines the student population to be served, (f) has a strong program design evidencing a creative perception of learning and instruction, (g) demonstrates that the various school resources are integrated into the project, (h) incorporates the wherewithal to respond to needs of the target population, (i) establishes a connection between problem definition, the type of student selected, and the program design, (j) provides a functional relationship between the off-site unit and the home school, (k) includes a reentry mechanism for students to the regular school program, and/or (l) has a guidance and counseling focus.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Program monitoring, checklists, school records, interviews, and achievement tests.

KEY FINDINGS

1972-1973 In information gathered from 20 of the 25 newly formed programs, 11 were reported to be implemented according to the standards of their proposals. The majority of these programs were viewed to be ready

for a more thorough evaluation during the 1973-1974 school year. Comparisons of those programs classified as being implemented with those classified as "not ready" seemed to indicate that the success of any implemented project was related to its being self-contained within a school, being under the direct supervision of the school principal, solving specific problems, and using fairly standard equipment and/or materials.

1973-1974 Only 31 (2.6%) of the 1,212 students in Title I alternative programs were classified as "dropouts" during the current school year. The retention of 97.4% of the participating students exceeded the criterion of a 50% retention rate.

The primary purpose of the testing was to establish baseline data for future annual comparisons of achievement-test scores. However, a sample of Alternative Programs students was included in both the midyear and end-of-year citywide testing programs. Although comparisons of standardized test scores with such a brief period of intervention are subject to many limitations, it was noted that approximately 62% of the Alternative Programs students maintained or improved their national percentile rank in reading and 50% maintained or improved their national percentile rank in mathematics.

Because of the effects of the teachers' strike upon the 1972-1973 school year, comparisons with data obtained for that year were limited. Comparison of average daily attendance (ADA) statistics revealed an improvement in ADA for students in 16 of the programs over their previous year's ADA in the regular school program. None of the 25 programs showed the expected 50% improvement in students' ADA.

The frequency of discipline referrals decreased for the students in 20 of the 25 programs. The minimum expectation of a 75% reduction over the previous year's accumulation of referrals in the regular school program was attained in only nine of the programs.

The total number of major subjects failed by students in 22 programs was less than the total number of subjects failed during the previous school year by these same students when they attended the regular school program. In 16 of the programs the minimum expectation of a 50% reduction in failures was attained.

The parents of students in alternative programs also expressed satisfaction with the instruction in reading (83%) and mathematics (81%) and the students' general experiences in the project (83%).

1974-1975 Alternative programs provided unique learning experiences and environments for students with discipline, attendance, and/or

achievement problems. The project's objectives were fully or partially attained. The project was most successful in retaining potential dropouts, reducing subject-matter failures, promoting positive parent and student attitudes toward school, and improving reading achievement and attendance. There was partial success in reducing disruptive behavior, promoting positive teacher attitudes toward alternative education, and improving mathematics achievement.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The evaluation of Alternative Programs for the 1975-1976 school year is being conducted under a time line that will provide information regarding the attainment of objectives on a site-by-site basis. The schedule for administration of the various tests, questionnaires, and interviews that are a part of this effort was developed to provide relevant information in time for decision making.*

In December 1975, the student and teacher questionnaires were administered. The Alternative Programs Student Record forms were scheduled for delivery in January, with a parent survey to be conducted in February. Results of these and other data-collection efforts will be reported to individual sites and the Alternative Programs Office.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Lea, Sayre, Sulzberger, University City, West Philadelphia
District 2: Barratt, Franklin, Penn, Vare, Vaux
District 3: Bartlett, Furness, South Philadelphia, Stoddart-Fleisher
District 4: Dobbins, FitzSimons, Gillespie, Gratz, Shoemaker, Strawberry Mansion
District 5: Kensington, Penn Treaty, Stetson, Wanamaker
District 6: Pickett, Roosevelt

BENCHMARK

ADMINISTRATOR:	Edmund J. Forte
HEADQUARTERS:	Room 903, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7819
PBRS CODE:	611-02-507
OPERATING YEARS:	1974-1976
GRADES SERVED:	4-6
NO. OF PUPILS:	1,240
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	31
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 35, Paraprofessional 62, Clerical 4
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $894,000, Summer $21,000, Total $915,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Arnold Escourt, Carrolyn Iwamoto, Fleta B. Waters

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The goal of Benchmark is to provide high-intensity basic skills instruction for low-achieving intermediate-grade children. The project provides small-group and individualized instructional experiences designed to raise each child's achievement. Each Benchmark school has two units which serve children in Grades 4-6 in a self-contained class setting.

The project is a "reduced class size" model with each teacher supported by a full-time aide, providing a pupil-adult ratio of 10:1. The instructional program is diagnostic and prescriptive. Traditional subject-matter areas are part of the curriculum; however, the primary emphasis is on the language arts and computational skills. Instructional techniques and materials are geared to accommodate the particular needs of the children. The instructional process in a Benchmark class unit tends toward nontraditional methods. All school services and activities are available to Benchmark pupils.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Project monitoring (using Observational Checklist), questionnaires, a phonics inventory, word lists, informal reading inventories, and appropriate levels of the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Test were utilized to gather data.

KEY FINDINGS

1974-1975 The program was planned in 1974 and implemented in January 1975. Because Benchmark was new, five of its objectives dealt with the process of organizing. Four of those enabling objectives were accomplished; attainment of the fifth could not be determined conclusively from the small number of questionnaire responses. The project's five pupil-achievement objectives were fully attained.

Records showed marked improvement in pupil performance on the Sight-Word List, individual reading inventories, ard the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Test. Eighty-four percent of the pupils had an attendance rate of 80% or better.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The Benchmark project is operating as planned. Each of the original enabling objectives was met. Pretest data pertaining to the instructional objectives have been collected. Observations and interviews with the project staff revealed teachers' feelings of success and worthiness and positive attitudes toward the project.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1:	Barry, Belmont, Daroff, Holmes, Locke, Washington
District 2:	Bache, Childs, Gideon, Morris
District 3:	Hawthorne, Jefferson, Kearny, Southwark, Spring Garden, Wister
District 4.	Blaine, Cleveland, Dick, Heston, Kenderton, Lehigh, Leidy, Stanton, Wright
District 5:	Ferguson, McKinley, Moffet
District 6:	East Falls, Steel
District 7:	Bethune

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

ADMINISTRATOR: Charles McLaughlin
HEADQUARTERS: 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue
TELEPHONE: BA 5-1914
PBRS CODE: 611-06-538
OPERATING YEARS: 1972-1976
GRADES SERVED: 1-12
NO. OF PUPILS: Nonpublic 807
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 10
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 14, Paraprofessional 6, Clerical 4
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $255,000, Summer $11,000, Total $266,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Marion Kaplan, Larry Aniloff*, Camilla Grigsby

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Bilingual Education project is designed to correct the deficiencies of Spanish speaking children relative to the development of language skills in English, the language of the classroom. These deficiencies were discovered through screening which revealed a degree of retardation of Spanish-speaking children in their performance in academic skills of nearly two full years when compared with a nationa norm.

The project initially attempts to improve achievement of the Spanish-speaking children in mathematics and reading by effecting an average gain of 10 months for each school year of instruction, to improve language competency in both English and Spanish, and to provide staff-development activities to improve teacher competency in communicating with Spanish-speaking children.

Some bilingual teachers and auxiliary bilingual teachers function in a Spanish center which provides instruction to approximately 120 to 160 students selected from the schools because of acute difficulty with English in performing in the regular class room setting. The remaining teachers function in the individual schools.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Standardized achievement tests, locally produced competency tests, and the Observational Checklist were used to evaluate pupil progress.

KEY FINDINGS

1972-1973 The learning center became operational in early spring and was functional for the remainder of the school year at approximately 60%

capacity. The six bilingual teachers in the participating schools functioned primarily as instructors of Spanish. The four teachers in the learning center concentrated primarily on the improvement of basic skills. All enabling objectives were achieved during the year.

1973-1974 Sixty-one percent of the pupils mastered two or more levels in mathematics, 46% mastered two or more levels in reading, and 45% mastered two or more levels in Spanish.

Further analysis of the records indicated that in Grades 4-8, 78% of the pupils mastered two or more skill levels in mathematics, 60% mastered two or more levels in reading, and 61% mastered two or more levels in Spanish. Thus, while the project was not successful in every grade in having 60% of the pupils gain two levels in each of the subjects, the 60% criterion was met in all subjects by the pupils in Grades 4-8.

With little variation from grade to grade, 178 (80%) of the 225 referred pupils attained mastery in the areas of deficiency for which they were referred. This represented progress toward, but not attainment of, the stated objective of 90%.

Comparison of 1973 and 1974 scores from the Bilingual Education Project Student Survey indicated no differences in the self-concepts or school-related attitudes of the pupils. Pupils' attitudes appeared to be neutral in both years.

1974-1975 The project was partially successful in attaining its objectives in the basic skill areas. Although the expected percentages of change in reading and mathematics mastery were not achieved, there was evidence that the project was successful in fostering some improvements in both subjects. The success of the project was best reflected by qualitative improvements in operation and the impetus provided by the new coordinator. These changes included more refined procedures for selecting and returning pupils to and from the Cariño Center, better recording of pupil progress, increased communication and greater rapport with participating schools, intensive instructional supervision, and more detailed curriculum planning.

1975-1976 (Preliminary findings) The implementation of the Cariño Center has improved over past years. Improved screening and record keeping and more intensive supervision of instruction should facilitate the attainment of the objectives for this component of the project.

It is less likely that the auxiliary teacher component will attain its objective. The three schools that have been in operation since

September are providing useful service to the pupils served; however, implementation in three other schools has been hampered by vacancies and changes in personnel.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Nonpublic: Cathedral, St. Bonaventure, St. Boniface, St. Edward, St. Francis Xavier, St. Malachy, St. Michael, St. Peter Apostle, St. Stephen, St. Veronica

COMPREHENSIVE MATHEMATICS "A": ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS RESOURCE TEACHER

ADMINISTRATOR: Alexander Tobin
HEADQUARTERS: Room 310, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE: 299-7811
PBRS CODE: 611-02-523
OPERATING YEARS: 1972-1976
GRADES SERVED: 2-6
NO. OF PUPILS: 61,417
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 113
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 114, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 2
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $1,919,000, Summer $6,000, Total $1,925,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Arnold Escourt, Carrolyn Iwamoto*, Fleta B. Waters

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A mathematics resource teacher assigned to each eligible Title I elementary school provides expertise in mathematics instruction to the teaching staff, pupils, and parents. The resource teacher's responsibilities include staff-development programs for the school's faculty, remediation for selected Title-I-eligible pupils, preparation and development of materials and activities for classroom use, and assistance in evaluating and monitoring pupil progress in the acquisition of mathematics skills.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Pupil progress is assessed with the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Test (also known as the Levels Test) and the California Achievement Tests (CAT).

KEY FINDINGS

1972-1973 The project was implemented on schedule. Each of the participating schools had a mathematics specialist assisting the teachers in developing and presenting more effective lessons in mathematics. Formative information was gathered to improve the project's impact. Plans were developed to provide individual and group mathematics-level progress data to each participating elementary school.

1973-1974 A median growth rate of two levels per year was indicated across all districts as measured by the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Test. This gain was equivalent to 0.75 year's growth (not the expected full year's growth) in one year. The median level of growth across districts as measured by the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Test indicated that two instructional levels (not the expected three) were achieved.

1974-1975 The Elementary Mathematics Resource Teacher component was fully implemented and was continuously monitored by the project supervisor. Its specific objectives were attained. The program appeared to be achieving the goal for which it was instituted--to halt the decline in mathematics achievement in Grades 1-6.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The EMRT program continues to provide staff development and assistance to teachers as in previous years. During the current year, additional emphasis is placed on individual pupil remediation. Implementation in the schools has occurred as planned. Observations indicate that the EMRTs are providing all requested services to the pupils and their teachers.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Barry, Belmont, Bryant, Comegys, Daroff, Drew, Dunlap, Hamilton, Harrington, Holmes, Huey, Lea, Locke, Longstreth, McMichael, Mitchell, Morton, Powel, Rhoads, Washington, Wilson, Wolf

District 2: Alcorn, Arthur, Bache, Benson, Bregy, Carver, Childs, Darrah, Douglass, Gideon, Kelley, Landreth, Martin, McDaniel, Meade, Morris, Peirce, Poe, Reynolds, Sartain, Smith, Stanton, Waring, Wayne

District 3: Hawthorne, Jackson, Jefferson, Kearny, Key, Kirkbride, Meredith, Nebinger, Southwark, Spring Garden, Vare, Washington, Wister

District 4: Blaine, Blankenburg, Cleveland, Dick, Duckrey, Hanna, Heston, Hill, Kenderton, Lehigh, Leidy, Peirce, Pratt-Arnold, Stanton, Stokley, Walton, Whittier, Wright

District 5: Brown, Clymer, Dunbar, Elverson, Fairhill, Ferguson, Hackett, Harrison, Hartranft, Hunter, Ludlow, McKinley, Miller, Moffet, Potter-Thomas, Powers, Sheppard, Thomas, Welsh, Willard

District 6: Dobson, East Falls, Emlen, Fulton, Kelly, Lingelbach, Logan, Mifflin, Pastorius, Pennell, Steel, Wister

District 7: Bethune, Smedley, Stearne, Taylor

COMPREHENSIVE MATHEMATICS "B": JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOL MATHEMATICS SPECIALIST

ADMINISTRATOR:	Alexander Tobin
HEADQUARTERS:	Room 310, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7811
PBRS CODE:	611-03-523
OPERATING YEARS:	1975-1976
GRADES SERVED:	7-9
NO. OF PUPILS:	18,704
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	24
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 25, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 1
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $336,000, Summer $22,000, Total $358,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Arnold Escourt, Carrolyn Iwamoto*, Fleta B. Waters

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Mathematics specialists assigned to eligible Title I junior high and middle schools serve both pupils and staff. They plan and implement the school's remediation program for eligible pupils, and diagnose pupil problems and prescribe programs of instruction for individual pupils. They also provide an ongoing program of staff development for the school's mathematics teachers by disseminating and demonstrating materials, activities, and techniques for classroom use.

The mathematics specialists participate in 50 hours of staff development prior to the operation of the program in the schools and attend 20 hours of further training during the school year.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Pupil achievement is measured by the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Test (below Level 10) and the Philadelphia Mathematics Evaluation Test--Survey Form A.

KEY FINDINGS

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The Junior High/Middle School Mathematics Specialist program extends the Elementary Mathematics Resource Teacher program to the junior high and middle schools. All needed specialists have been assigned and the program has been implemented according to plan in all the Title I middle and junior high schools.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1:	Sayre, Shaw, Sulzberger, Tilden
District 2:	Audenried, Barratt, Vare, Vaux
District 3:	Bartlett, Furness, Stoddart-Fleisher
District 4:	FitzSimons, Gillespie, Rhodes, Shoemaker, Strawberry Mansion
District 5:	Jones, Penn Treaty, Stetson, Wanamaker
District 6:	Pickett, Roosevelt
District 7:	Cooke, Pennsylvania Advancement

COMPREHENSIVE MATHEMATICS "C": SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL MATHEMATICS SPECIALISTS AND SKILL CENTERS

ADMINISTRATOR: Alexander Tobin
HEADQUARTERS: Room 310, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE: 299-7811
PBRS CODE: 611-04-523
OPERATING YEARS: 1975-1976
GRADES SERVED: 10-12
NO. OF PUPILS: 16,934
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 11
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 22, Paraprofessional 11, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $401,000, Summer $15,000, Total $416,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Arnold Escourt, Carrolyn Iwamoto*, Fleta B. Waters

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project has two distinct components: a tenth-grade mathematics specialist program and an 11th- and 12th-grade skill-center program. Mathematics specialists assigned to each Title I senior high school provide remedial mathematics instruction in small groups to eligible pupils enrolled in 10th-grade mathematics classes and staff development to the mathematics teachers of these pupils. Diagnoses and prescriptions are also provided for individual pupils.

In the other component, mathematics teachers assisted by aides provide remedial mathematics instruction in a skill center setting to eligible 11th- and 12th-grade nonacademic pupils.

Each mathematics specialist and skill-center teacher participates in a 50-hour staff-development program prior to participation in the project in the schools and receives at least 20 hours of further training during the school year.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Pupil achievement is measured by the Mathematics Computation section of the California Achievement Tests (CAT).

KEY FINDINGS

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The two components of the senior high school mathematics project were initiated during the current school year to bolster the mathematics skills of high school pupils. Program operation began in November 1975 and is proceeding on schedule. The mathematics specialists and skill-center teachers and aides are scheduling instructional activities for all Title-I-eligible pupils during the year.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Bartram, University City, West Philadelphia
District 2: Franklin Sr. High, Penn
District 3: Bok, South Philadelphia
District 4: Dobbins, Gratz
District 5: Edison, Kensington

COMPREHENSIVE MATHEMATICS "D": ACTIVITY-CENTERED MATHEMATICS FOR RETARDED EDUCABLE CHILDREN

ADMINISTRATOR:	Alexander Tobin
HEADQUARTERS:	Room 310, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7811
PBRS CODE:	611-05-523
OPERATING YEARS:	1972-1976
GRADES SERVED:	Retarded Educable
NO. OF PUPILS:	432
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	23
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 1, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $37,000, Summer $16,000, Total $53,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Arnold Escourt, Carrolyn Iwamoto*, Fleta B. Waters

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Teachers of retarded educable children attend a summer in-service program to learn about techniques and activities which they may be able to use in their mathematics program. Each participating teacher is provided with the instructional aids, materials, books, and equipment necessary for activity-centered mathematics.

During the school year, a special education teacher with a strong background in mathematics provides ongoing assistance to the teachers. An additional three-hour workshop is provided monthly on Saturdays between September and June for teachers to discuss progress, share ideas, discuss immediate problems, and develop a curriculum suitable for the needs of retarded educable children.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Pupil progress is measured by the KeyMath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test. Teacher attitude toward mathematics is measured by the Yoa-Ayrer-Tobin (YAT) Attitude-Toward-Mathematics Test.

KEY FINDINGS

1972-1973 On the Individual Arithmetic Test for Educable Mentally Retarded Children, pupils of ages 9-12 in classrooms involved in activities using concrete materials showed significantly better gains than children in classrooms not using this approach. Teacher attitude toward mathematics remained very positive throughout the year.

1973-1974 Comparison of pretest and posttest scores on the KeyMath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test showed an increase in score that was significant at the .005 level.

1974-1975 The objectives of Activity-Centered Mathematics for Retarded Educable Children were met, and there was evidence of pupil progress in the acquisition of basic mathematics skills in the areas of content, operations, and application. There was emphasis in the staff-development sessions to use concrete, manipulatory techniques of the Activity-Centered Mathematics Program. Results on the YAT Attitude Test indicated that the initial positive attitude of the teachers toward the teaching of mathematics was maintained.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The project is being implemented as planned and the designated pretests have been given.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Huey, Tilden, Wilson
District 2: Alcorn, Arthur, Bache, Reynolds, Smith, Wayne
District 3: Jefferson, Kearny, Kirkbride, Meredith
District 4: Dick, Kenderton, Peirce, Pratt-Arnold, Whittier
District 5: Carroll, Fairhill, Hackett
District 6: Fulton, Steel

COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT

The Comprehensive Reading Project has several components, which are reported consecutively in the following order:

Aide Services
District 1 Reading
District 2 Reading
District 3 Reading
District 4 Reading
District 5 Reading
District 6 Reading
District 7 Reading
Improvement of Reading Skills "A" and "B"
Improvement of Reading Skills "C"
Individualized Education Center
Intensive Reading for Secondary Students
Language Arts Reading Camps
Operation Individual
Primary Reading Skills Centers
Reading Improvement through Teacher Education
Summer Reading Readiness

AIDE SERVICES
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR:	("A")	Frances Becker (Kindergarten Aides) Leontine Scott (Aides in Grades 1-3)
	("B")	Joan Myers (LIMAs)
	("C")	Charles McLaughlin (Parent Aides)
HEADQUARTERS:	("A")	Room B-14, 21st Street and Parkway Room 510, 21st Street and Parkway
	("B")	Room 301, 21st Street and Parkway
	("C")	2901 W. Allegheny Avenue
TELEPHONE:	("A")	299-7934, 299-7659
	("B")	299-7783
	("C")	BA 5-1914
PBRS CODE:	("A")	611-01-506, 611-02-518
	("B")	611-02-503
	("C")	611-06-613
OPERATING YEARS:	1966-1976	
GRADES SERVED:	K-12	
NO. OF PUPILS:	("A") 4,907, ("B") 97,055, ("C") 11,350	
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	127 Public, 48 Nonpublic	
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 2, Paraprofessional 309, Clerical 4	
CURRENT BUDGET:	("A") Regular $1,496,000, Summer None, Total $1,496,000	
	("B") Regular $675,000, Summer $4,000, Total $679,000	
	("C") Regular $646,000, Summer None, Total $646,000	
EVALUATION TEAM:	Arnold Escourt, William E. Loue III, Carrolyn Iwamoto, Judith Green Leibovitz, Lisbeth Sorkin, Fleta B. Waters*	

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Four projects which in prior years focused on the services of paraprofessionals to teachers and Title I pupils have been grouped together due to their similarity. Each of these projects provides training and experience to enable aides to assist teachers and to work with groups of Title-I-eligible children as tutors, resource persons, and assistants. Emphasis is placed on improving the basic skills of children, especially in reading. Aides' participation in the educational process allows teachers to plan instruction around individual and group needs and permits more individualized attention to specific needs of individual children.

("A") K-3 Aides: Experienced kindergarten aides provide a higher adult/pupil ratio, relieve the classroom teacher of many clerical duties, provide additional support for managing the classroom, and allow utilization of individualized instructional techniques. District supervisors plan and conduct workshops,

seminars, child-development conferences, and individual observations and evaluations of aides. These supervisors also work with teachers to develop the types of organization which encourage greater involvement of the children and their parents.

Classroom aides in Grades 1-3 are assigned to no more than three classes to assist teachers with individual and group instruction, clerical help, and housekeeping chores. Most of their time is devoted to assisting with instruction. A training coordinator plans, implements, and supervises aide workshops and classroom activities.

("B") Library Instructional Materials Assistants: Instructional materials centers (IMCs) in Title I schools are maintained by library instructional materials assistants (LIMAs) with the assistance of district library supervisors and the central library office personnel. The LIMAs support the School District's comprehensive reading program by maintaining and distributing a collection of selected high-interest reading materials, and Spanish materials and books in bilingual schools, and by publicizing reading materials through bulletin boards and special exhibits in classrooms, halls, and the library/IMC. They gather materials requested by teachers and assist Title-I-eligible pupils with their assignments or projects.

("C") Parent Aides: Parents receive training and experience in using individualized reading and mathematics programs in nonpublic schools. They are directed by classroom teachers in working with small groups or individual children in subject areas diagnosed as weak. The teacher is thus enabled to develop a program which incorporates individualized instruction that allows children to develop at their own level and rate of progress.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Structured observational systems, checklists, surveys, and questionnaires are utilized to evaluate the training and activities of aides.

KEY FINDINGS

1966-1973 ("A") No significant differences were noted between the readiness-test scores of first-grade pupils with and without kindergarten aides the previous year. It was observed that the full-time and one-third-time kindergarten aides were more effective than half-time aides. Comparisons of Reading and Total Arithmetic scores (ITBS) showed that aides had not significantly improved progress beyond that of classes without aides in Grades 1-3. Staff-development sessions held by the supervisors were found useful in suggesting methods which were then incorporated into classroom practices. Data from the observational checklist corroborated earlier findings that the kindergarten supervisor was perceived as useful by classroom teachers.

The presence of the aide reduced the number of noninstructional tasks the teacher was performing. Teacher interviews and classroom observations confirmed widespread use of aides in Grades K-3 for tasks which, without the aide, would have limited the amount of time the teacher would have for teaching. The presence of the aide increased the amount of individualized or small-group instruction time. Teacher interviews and classroom observations indicated that such individualization occurred when aides were used for instructional tasks, but not when they were used for noninstructional tasks.

Classroom monitoring and structured interviews with principals and teachers indicated that the Kindergarten Aides program was self-contained and efficient because the kindergarten aides were assigned to only one grade. But certain changes within the Classroom Aides project (Grades 1-3) had seriously undermined its effectiveness. The lack of a project director led to a gradual breakdown of specific definition and direction. This situation was compounded by the removal of consultant teachers, who had been responsible for the assigning, monitoring, and developing of aides. Since their removal, some of these tasks became the responsibility of other school personnel (e.g., reading teacher and principal), and other tasks were not performed. In some schools, some of the aides were redesignated to other programs and attended college in the afternoon. This resulted in a reduction in the available aide service in those schools. These conditions impaired the effectiveness and viability of the CA project.

("B") Surveys indicated that books, hardware, and software were installed and used, and that principals felt in-service programs were needed to assist teachers in making better use of the instructional materials centers (IMCs). The construction stage was completed. Both principals and teachers felt that the IMCs were needed and suggested methods by which the facility could be of maximum benefit to pupils and teachers.

IMCs were found to be understaffed and experiencing difficulty in providing services to teachers and pupils. Card catalogs were accurate in 86% of the buildings visited. The library assistant was generally available to make instructional materials for the teacher. Student performance tended to be spotty. In general, the development or utilization of IMCs was limited to updating and maintenance functions.

In observations made during the school year, facilities were found to be attractive and well equipped (93% of the observations) with regularly appointed staff and teachers providing necessary services (85%). Appropriate nonprint materials in a wide range were available (64%)

and displays of interest to students and teachers were observed (86%). Community volunteers were rarely observed (17%). Formal instruction in the IMC was observed 14% of the time.

("C") A survey of 45 principals revealed that parent aides were performing basic administrative/clerical tasks and low-level instructional activities--all of which extended the instructional services of the classroom teachers. Greater in-service training was suggested to increase the proficiency of the aide with respect to mastery of higher-level instructional skills. Closer coordination with the in-service component of the Multimedia project was found desirable in attaining the required level of mastery.

Interviews were conducted with 29 aides and 34 teachers from seven randomly selected schools in the project. The aides expressed feelings of satisfaction, reward, and importance from their efforts. The teachers agreed on the importance and value of parent aides and indicated that, without aides to assist them, their efforts to individualize instruction would be futile. With aides devoting most of their time and effort to working on reading-skill improvement with slower children, both teachers and aides expressed concern for the slower children if aides were not available.

1973-1974 ("A") In Grades K-3, objectives were attained: (a) teachers with aides were observed devoting more time to individual and small-group instruction than teachers without aides; (b) the aides' presence led to less frequent discipline incidents in project classes than in non-project classes, enabling the teacher to conduct her lesson without interruption, and relieved the teacher of many clerical duties that were done by teachers without aides.

("B") Findings closely paralleled those of previous years. The materials and aides in the IMCs provided resources to pupils and staff. It was apparent that if the services of library aides were reduced, many facilities would be unable to function adequately, if at all. The project was implemented as planned. Library aides performed the services required of them according to the established guidelines, providing teachers and pupils with materials and resources supporting the School District's comprehensive reading program.

("C") Observations revealed that provision of parent aides for classroom teachers did facilitate small-group and individualized instruction in reading, language arts, and mathematics, in harmony with the project's stated objectives. Comparison of scores on the retrospective pretest and posttest of the Major Classroom Problems Checklist yielded

no significant differences. Although teachers perceived fewer problems when they had the services of a paraprofessional than in situations where such services were not available, the difference was small.

1974-1975 ("A") The kindergarten project's overall objective was fully attained. In comparison with non-KA classes, the KA classes were characterized by significantly more small-group instruction, less teacher lecturing and direction-giving, less assignment of every pupil to the same task, and less teacher time spent in housekeeping and clerical tasks and in disciplining pupils.

Two of the subobjectives for Grades 1-3 were fully attained: (a) aides served only in Grades 1-3; (b) aides were assigned an average of two classes per day. The third subobjective was partially attained: aides spent less than the desired 65% of their daily time in supervising and/or tutoring individuals or small groups, came close to the target maximum of 15% for clerical tasks, and were below the maximum of 20% specified for such activities as class trips, operation of audiovisual equipment, housekeeping tasks, and supervision of breakfast/lunch programs.

("B") Four of the six objectives for instructional materials centers were fully attained. Library assistants performed the clerical and mechanical tasks that are necessary for the organization and maintenance of an IMC. Book displays on central themes led to significantly greater circulation of books on those themes. Four staff-development sessions were conducted for the LAs on how to provide supportive services for the school's reading program. In bilingual schools, special assistance was given to Spanish-speaking children and their parents in the selection of reading materials in English and/or in Spanish. The objective of providing semiannual lists of recommended books and other materials was not attained, partly because of unfilled LA positions in the fall. The objective of setting up record-level files was partially attained; two thirds of the observed LAs had accomplished this task.

("C") The Parent Aides project was partially implemented according to its intended mode of operation. Although budgetary considerations caused some positions to remain vacant, principals, teachers, and aides continued to express satisfaction regarding the project. The formal in-service training program organized by the project's three experienced coordinators for all aides was effective and useful. Teachers and principals reported that the aides contributed significantly in enabling classroom teachers to individualize their respective instructional programs.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Each of the aide projects is operating as described in the Title I Application. Almost all vacant posts have been filled and aides are scheduled and functioning at each Title I site. Interviews with teachers have indicated a very high respect for and reliance on the services provided by the aides.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Barry, Bartram, Belmont, Bryant, Catto, Daroff, Dunlap, Hamilton, Harrington, Huey, Lea, Locke, Longstreth, Mitchell, Morton, Powel, Rhoads, Sayre, Shaw, Sulzberger, Tilden, Walnut Center, Washington, Wolf

District 2: Alcorn, Audenried, Bache, Barratt, Benson, Bregy, Carver, Childs, Darrah, Douglass, Franklin Sr. High, Gideon, Kane, Kelley, Landreth, McDaniel, Meade, Morris, Peirce, Penn, Poe, Reynolds, Sartain, Smith, Vare, Vaux, Waring, Wayne

District 3: Bartlett, Bok, Furness, Hawthorne, Jackson, Jefferson, Kearny, Key, Kirkbride, Meredith, South Philadelphia, Southwark, Spring Garden, Stoddart-Fleisher, Vare, Washington, Wister

District 4: Blaine, Blankenburg, Cleveland, Dick, Dobbins, Duckrey, FitzSimons, Gillespie, Gratz, Hanna, Heston, Hill, Kenderton, Lehigh, Leidy, Miller, Peirce, Shoemaker, Stanton, Stokley, Strawberry Mansion, Walton, Whittier, Wright

District 5: Brown, Carroll, Clymer, Douglas, Edison, Elverson, Fairhill, Ferguson, Hackett, Hartranft, Hunter, Jones, Kensington, Ludlow, McKinley, Miller, Moffet, Penn Treaty, Potter-Thomas, Sheppard, Stetson, Wanamaker, Welsh

District 6: Dobson, East Falls, Emlen, Fulton, Kelly, Logan, Mifflin, Pennell, Roosevelt

District 7: Bethune, Taylor

Nonpublic: Archbishop Ryan, Cathedral, Corpus Christi, Gesu, Immaculate Conception A, Immaculate Conception B, Mercy Technical, Most Blessed Sacrament, Most Precious Blood, Our Lady of Confidence, Our Lady of Holy Souls, Our Lady of Mercy, Our Lady of Rosary, Our Lady of Victory, Our Mother of Sorrows, Sacred Heart, St. Agatha, St. Anne, St. Anthony, St. Bonaventure, St. Boniface, St. Bridget, St. Carthage, St. Charles, St. Columba, St. Edward, St. Elizabeth, St. Francis de Sales, St. Francis Xavier, St. Gabriel, St. Gregory, St. Ignatius, St. Katherine Day, St. Madeleine Sophie, St. Malachy, St. Mary Eternal, St. Michael, St. Paul, St. Peter Apostle, St. Peter Claver, St. Philip Neri, St. Rita, St. Rose of Lima, St. Stephen, St. Veronica, St. Vincent de Paul, Transfiguration, Visitation

DISTRICT 1 READING
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR:	Verneta Harvey
HEADQUARTERS:	Locke School
TELEPHONE:	EV 6-8540
PBRS CODE:	611-02(03,04,05)-571
OPERATING YEARS:	1970-1976
GRADES SERVED:	K-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	23,374
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	34
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 34, Paraprofessional 202, Clerical 3
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $818,000, Summer $13,000, Total $831,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Sharon Rose, Judith Zernik

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Most of the elementary schools in District 1 are Title I schools. In addition to the basic materials used in all the elementary schools and the supplementary materials which enhance the basic program, the Title I schools have selected additional materials to use with eligible Title I children. Most Title I elementary schools also utilize the Title I funds for additional reading aides.

The Title I secondary schools have their Title-I-eligible pupils organized into reading classes for additional periods of reading instruction. This is made possible by the employment of additional reading teachers and aides.

Extensive staff development is scheduled for all Title I reading personnel, with intensified sessions required for new staff members.

To augment existing reading materials, the secondary Title I schools use a variety of supplementary materials to meet the specific needs of Title I pupils.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Standardized tests, informal reading inventory, observation, surveys, and interviews.

KEY FINDINGS

1970-1975 Establishment of the District 1 Reading program was a result of the decision by administrators that reading test scores were discouragingly low. The project incorporated the use of a wide range of reading materials and methods.

During the project's first five years various instruments were administered to pupils in order to assess their reading proficiency. Pupils demonstrated an overall improvement in the percentage of mastery on the phonics inventory from 1972 to 1975, although the achievement was not consistent across all the subtests.

An examination of the standardized reading tests for four years revealed steady improvement in the elementary grades; however, the various tests used during this period of time were not necessarily directly comparable.

In general, there was evidence of reading improvement in the district. While the mastery level of Title I schools was generally lower than that of other schools, the rate of improvement was higher in the Title I schools.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) For all eligible pupils, reading materials, to supplement those which are included in the basic reading program, are being ordered and incorporated into the Title I reading program. Attainment of objectives will be examined in light of the materials used and the manner in which the reading program was implemented in each school.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Barry, Bartram, Belmont, Bryant, Catto, Comegys, Daroff, Drew, Dunlap, Hamilton, Harrington, Harrity, Holmes, Huey, Lea Elementary, Lea Jr. High, Locke, Longstreth, McMichael, Mitchell, Morton, Powel, Read, Rhoads, Sayre, Shaw, Sulzberger, Tilden, University City, Walnut Center, Washington, West Philadelphia, Wilson, Wolf

DISTRICT 2 READING
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Michael Iannelli
HEADQUARTERS: Drexel School
TELEPHONE: 299-7205
PBRS CODE: 611-02(03,04,05)-572
OPERATING YEARS: 1970-1976
GRADES SERVED: K-12
NO. OF PUPILS: 16,835
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 32
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 16, Paraprofessional 115, Clerical 3
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $770,000, Summer $27,000, Total $797,000
EVALUATION TEAM: James Scheib, James Comerford

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

District 2's Title I resources are allocated to personnel, supplementary materials, and staff development serving Title I pupils in Title-I-eligible schools. Project supportive staff at the district level serve all such schools in the district. Paraprofessional personnel (aides) are provided at both elementary and secondary levels, as are various supplementary classroom materials. Secondary teachers of reading are provided and receive staff development.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Standardized tests, informal reading inventory, observation, surveys, and interviews.

KEY FINDINGS

1970-1975 Over the first five years of the project, better implementation and results were found with younger children. With the older pupils, programmatic effects, as measured by standardized tests, were less evident. However, some signs of progress were found in the secondary schools' 1975 results. The results for Grade 5 in 1975 (percentage scoring above the national 16th percentile) were indicative of the amount of progress made by the youngest group of pupils who were in the regular grades during the five years of the original plan. These results were better than for any fifth grade in the previous four years; as a group, these pupils generally excelled their predecessors each year. Perhaps a contributing factor to this pattern was the greater degree of stability in the lower grades.

In general, greater gains were made on the vocabulary subtests. At the end of 1972, comprehension subtest scores were higher than vocabulary scores in Grades 4-12. As a result of this, special emphasis was given to teaching vocabulary skills. While scores increased on both tests, the difference between vocabulary and comprehension scores was less in 1975 than in 1971 and 1972.

Over the first five years, greater gains have been achieved by the lower-scoring pupils. Two factors seemed to be operating: (a) through remediation, it was easier to increase the reading scores of low-scoring pupils than to increase those of pupils already scoring around the national average; (b) the emphasis of the District 2 Reading program was on pupils reading below average.

Kindergarten test results indicated that the most successful programs were those using broad-based materials (e.g., Bank Street). Continuing emphasis upon this concept was recommended.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Numerous changes were incorporated into the District 2 reading plan this year. To evaluate the project in relation to its objectives, preliminary data have been collected. The CAT will be administered in February and the Sight and Sound Phonics Inventory will be administered in the spring.*

Staff development and instrument development by the District Reading Team have continued in order to provide upgraded teaching and improved diagnosis of pupils' needs.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 2: Alcorn, Arthur-AMY, Audenried, Bache, Barratt, Benson, Bregy, Carver, Childs, Darrah, Douglass, Franklin Sr. High, Franklin Learning Center, Gideon, Kane, Kelley, Landreth, Martin, McDaniel, Meade, Morris, Peirce, Penn, Poe, Reynolds, Sartain, Smith, Stanton, Vare, Vaux, Waring, Wayne

DISTRICT 3 READING
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Arthur N. Romanelli
HEADQUARTERS: District 3 Education Services Center
TELEPHONE: 299-7309
PBRS CODE: 611-01(02,03,04,05)-573
OPERATING YEARS: 1970-1976
GRADES SERVED: K-12
NO. OF PUPILS: 8,099
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 20
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 13, Paraprofessional 86, Clerical 2
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $400,000, Summer $5,000, Total $405,000
EVALUATION TEAM: James Scheib, Brenda Cohen

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

District 3's Title I resources are allocated to personnel, supplementary materials, and staff development serving Title I pupils in Title-I-eligible schools. Project supportive staff at the district level serve all such schools in the district. Paraprofessional personnel (aides) are provided at both elementary and secondary levels, as are various supplementary classroom materials. Consulting teachers serve as additional resource personnel to elementary schools. Secondary teachers of reading are provided and receive staff development.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Standardized tests, informal reading inventory, observation, surveys, and interviews.

KEY FINDINGS

1970-1975 Longitudinal results from the California Achievement Tests showed a consistent pattern of improvement in Title I schools. However, fewer grades in Title I schools than in other schools improved in vocabulary, comprehension, and total reading scores. In 1971, Title I pupils' scores were generally lower than those of non-Title-I pupils; although general improvement was shown by both groups in Grades 1-6, the non-Title-I group showed larger gains in Grades 3-9.

In 1975 the Title I pupils in Grades 2 and 3 showed larger gains than the non-Title-I pupils, and in second grade the Title I pupils tied the non-Title-I group in the proportion scoring at or above the national 16th percentile in comprehension. Above Grade 6, the gains of the Title I group were inconsistent. Grade 9 remained essentially unchanged for the Title I group.

Since Grade 1 was not tested with the CAT in 1971, comparisons between Title I and non-Title-I schools began at Grade 2. Comparisons between Title I and non-Title-I schools ended at Grade 9 since both District 3 senior high schools were Title I schools.

In its first five years, the project was most productive with the younger pupils. Although some gains were seen in the upper grades, the Title I secondary program appeared to need improvement.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Elementary school reading aides support classroom teachers in serving Title-I-eligible pupils. Eligible secondary pupils scoring below the 33rd percentile on the February 1975 CAT are receiving additional periods of reading instruction. Staff development and instrument development programs are being continued in order to provide upgraded teaching and diagnostic efforts.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 3: All Ages, Bartlett, Bok, Boone, Furness, Hawthorne, Jackson, Jefferson, Kearny, Key, Kirkbride, Meredith, Nebinger, South Philadelphia, Southwark, Spring Garden, Stoddart-Fleisher, Vare, Washington, Wister

DISTRICT 4 READING
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Katherine C. Jackson
HEADQUARTERS: District 4 Reading Office
TELEPHONE: CE 5-1706, -7, -8
PBRS CODE: 611-02(03,04,05)-574
OPERATING YEARS: 1970-1976
GRADES SERVED: K-12
NO. OF PUPILS: 18,847
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 26
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 10, Paraprofessional 139, Clerical 2
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $749,000, Summer $13,000, Total $762,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Sharon Rose, Nicholas Rongione

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In addition to the basic reading program in District 4, eligible pupils in Title I schools are provided with supplementary reading materials and instructional aides. Title I reading teachers and aides receive extensive staff development. All new reading teachers attend an additional series of in-service sessions.

In the Title I secondary schools, eligible pupils are rostered into small classes meeting several times a week in addition to whatever other reading or English classes they attend. This is facilitated by employment of Title I reading teachers and aides and provision of new reading materials to supplement basic reading materials already in the schools.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Standardized tests, informal reading inventory, observation, surveys, and interviews.

KEY FINDINGS

1970-1975 A long-range plan was initiated in District 4 to improve reading achievement. Although varied reading materials were incorporated into the program, beginning in 1970, the Behavioral Research Laboratories/Sullivan (BRL) materials were used extensively, especially with pupils reading at least one year below grade level. Title I schools received and used additional resources.

The California Achievement Tests and the Botel Phonics Inventory were administered to all pupils for four years. In general, on the CAT there was improvement in reading, with the most dramatic changes taking place at the lower end of the distribution. The most consistent progress and highest relative achievement took place in the lower grades. Title I schools began to approach the achievement levels of the non-Title-I schools. On the phonics inventory all groups showed improved mastery over time, irrespective of special materials or resources; the Title I schools showed an increased rate of improvement.

The District 4 reading plan reached many of its goals. However, there was room for further improvement.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) A determination of the extent and method of the Title I reading program's implementation in District 4 will be made by interviewing members of the District Reading Team, reading teachers, and school principals and by making on-site observations. The findings will then be interpreted in the context of the reading program as it is found in each of the district's Title I schools.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 4: Blaine, Blankenburg, Cleveland, Dick, Dobbins, Duckrey, FitzSimons, Gillespie, Gratz, Hanna, Heston, Hill, Kenderton, Lehigh, Leidy, Miller, Peirce, Pratt-Arnold, Rhodes, Shoemaker, Stanton, Stokley, Strawberry Mansion, Walton, Whittier, Wright

DISTRICT 5 READING
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR:	Irving Rosen
HEADQUARTERS:	District 5 Education Services Center
TELEPHONE:	BA 6-5131, -2
PBRS CODE:	611-02(03,04,05)-575
OPERATING YEARS:	1970-1976
GRADES SERVED:	K-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	16,271
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	28
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 1, Paraprofessional 244, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $745,000, Summer $3,000, Total $748,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Alan Solomon, Jay Rosemoff

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Most of the Title-I-eligible schools in District 5 use Lippincott materials in the early grades, and continue their use in the upper elementary grades. BRL materials are offered as an alternative for those pupils experiencing difficulties in the Lippincott series. Additionally, Title I funding is used to provide reading aides, who work with large and small groups and with individuals. Schools offer staff development for the aides.

In Title I secondary schools, the project provides reading aides, materials, and supplies for eligible pupils.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Standardized tests, informal reading inventory, observation, surveys, and interviews.

KEY FINDINGS

1970-1975 According to standardized test results, District 5 pupils were reading at a higher level in 1975 than at the inception of the project. No specific activity was isolated as a reason for this improvement. Suggestions included teacher performance, administration of the project, and systematic instruction through essentially a single reading program.

Secondary schools used local programs developed by the respective schools in response to the perceived needs of their pupils. It was suggested that a systematic district-based program might have been more fruitful in terms of standardized test scores.

Within the city, District 5 ranked at the bottom in percentages of pupils scoring above the 16th and 50th percentiles. But the gap was narrowing and appeared to be well on its way to elimination.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Classroom observations are being made in order to check on the project's implementation. No problems have been noted pertaining to delivery of materials and supplies.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 5: Brown, Carroll, Clymer, Douglas, Dunbar, Edison, Elverson, Fairhill, Ferguson, Hackett, Harrison, Hartranft, Hunter, Jones, Kensington, Ludlow, McKinley, Miller, Moffet, Muhr, Penn Treaty, Potter-Thomas, Sheppard, Stetson, Thomas, Wanamaker, Welsh, Willard-Powers

DISTRICT 6 READING
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Norman Kline
HEADQUARTERS: District 6 Education Services Center
TELEPHONE: IV 2-8293
PBRS CODE: 611-02(03,05)-576
OPERATING YEARS: 1970-1976
GRADES SERVED: 1-8
NO. OF PUPILS: 8,974
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 16
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 4, Paraprofessional 108, Clerical 1
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $323,000, Summer None, Total $323,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Joseph Gavin

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The District 6 Reading project (Title I) supplements the basic reading program in the district's Title I elementary and middle schools.

In elementary schools and in Grades 5 and 6 of the middle schools, eligible pupils receive supplementary reading instruction. Additional professional personnel, classroom aides, and materials are used to diagnose pupil weaknesses in reading and to provide instruction in areas of difficulty.

In middle school Grades 7 and 8, pupils who scored below the 16th percentile on the CAT or comparably on a group reading inventory receive 45 minutes of reading instruction daily.

Pupils who scored at the 16th through 32nd percentiles on the 1975 CAT or comparably on a group reading inventory receive 45 minutes of daily instruction in reading in classes with a maximum size of 20.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Informal Reading Inventory, Phonics Inventory, the Reading sections of the California Achievement Tests (CAT), and observation.

KEY FINDINGS

1970-1975 The District 6 reading plan was a school-centered project. Members of the District Reading Team worked closely with task forces established

in each school to assure that school programs would meet local needs and at the same time be consistent with the priorities of the district. Initial priorities in instruction were given to the primary grades and gradually expanded to include the intermediate and secondary grades.

School staffs received direct support from the District Reading Team on site during the ongoing instructional program and in teacher workshops. The team also monitored the program and assisted each school in its planning.

All elementary schools used some form of the basal reader approach. Secondary schools used a corrective approach for the lowest-achieving students and emphasized a developmental reading program within the total language-arts program and other content areas.

Progress was measured using student achievement on standardized tests. In the project's first five years, the percentage of District 6 pupils scoring above the School District's norms increased. The increase in Title I schools was slightly greater than that in non-Title-I schools. In relation to national norms, in 1974-1975 the District 6 reading achievement improved in Grades 1-8 but was unchanged in Grades 9-12. Non-Title-I schools registered greater gains in Grades 1-4. Title I and non-Title-I schools made similar gains in Grades 5-8.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Programs in all schools were operational with all eligible pupils participating by October 15.*

Testing of pupils without CAT scores was completed by October 15. All diagnostic tests were completed by December 20. Data on pupil reading levels were to be collected by the end of January.

Reading supervisors make weekly visits to each school to observe the program and conduct staff development.

The district task force has observed each program and reviewed progress with the local task force.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 6: Dobson, East Falls, Emlen, Fulton, Kelly, Kinsey, Lingelbach, Logan, Mifflin, Pastorius, Pennell, Pickett, Roosevelt, Steel, Widener, Wister

DISTRICT 7 READING
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Reeda Kravinsky
HEADQUARTERS: Horn Curriculum Center
TELEPHONE: JE 5-3531, -2
PBRS CODE: 611-02(03,04)-577
OPERATING YEARS: 1970-1976
GRADES SERVED: K-9
NO. OF PUPILS: 4,655
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 13
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 5, Paraprofessional 68, Clerical 1
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $290,000, Summer None, Total $290,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Alan Solomon

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Eligible pupils in the Title I schools of District 7 receive additional help through reading aides and materials designed to meet their needs. Reading aides are assigned to small groups of pupils and carry out teachers' instructions. Staff development conducted by school personnel is provided for the aides.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Standardized tests, informal reading inventory, observation, surveys, and interviews.

KEY FINDINGS

1970-1975 Progress through the project's first five years was inconsistent. Some grades made consistent gains but others did not. Comparing Title I and non-Title-I schools over the five years was difficult because some facilities had Title I support for the time span, while others did not. In 1974-1975, both Title I and non-Title-I facilities showed improvement over the previous year.

With the district moving away from mandated programs, low-achieving schools drifted from Merrill Linguistics and McGraw-Hill/Sullivan to Basal. Administratively, however, the cluster system lost none of its original attractiveness. Cluster leaders had developed strong personal bonds with teachers, administrators, and staff in the schools they served. Such relationships mitigated minor administrative problems and eased school entry.

The District 7 Reading program had the tools for achieving its goals: a corps of experienced reading personnel in the schools and the district office, a strong delivery system, and an articulated standardized reading measure.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) In the elementary schools served by Title I, problems arising because of overcrowding have not been completely resolved.*

Materials especially ordered for Title I pupils were not delivered on schedule to all schools. Aides were observed using various duplicated materials in their stead.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 7: All Ages, Bethune, Birney, Cooke, Cramp, Howe, McClure, Pennsylvania Advancement, Philadelphia Youth Development Day Treatment Center, Smedley, Stearne, Taylor, Youth Development Center.

IMPROVEMENT OF READING SKILLS "A" AND "B"
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Marjorie Farmer
HEADQUARTERS: Room 322, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE: 299-7787
PBRS CODE: 611-02-666
OPERATING YEARS: 1966-1976
GRADES SERVED: 4-6
NO. OF PUPILS: 3,200
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 16 Public, 3 Nonpublic
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 16, Paraprofessional 22, Clerical 1
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $372,000, Summer None, Total $372,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Arnold Escourt, Carrolyn Iwamoto, Fleta B. Waters

---

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

("A") At Reading Skills Centers, underachieving readers work on individually prescribed programs utilizing multilevel, multimedia, and multisensory materials. Each child works on his specific skill needs, pinpointed through diagnostic testing, and also has opportunity for language enrichment as well as reading motivation through a literature program in which he has self-selection options. Those children needing the most help come to the center most frequently, three or four times a week; others may come once or twice a week. A full-time reading teacher is assisted by one full-time aide and one half-time aide.

("B") Shared-time reading teachers work with small groups of underachieving children in a small-group and individualized reading program using multilevel materials. They work half time in a public school and half time in a parochial school. They take into their groups the poorest readers in the fourth, fifth, and sixth (sometimes also seventh) grades of the schools in which they serve.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Comparisons of growth in reading comprehension, word-attack skills, phonics (Botel's Phonics Mastery Test), and a structured observation system.

KEY FINDINGS

1966-1973 Meaningful but not statistically significant gain in reading and general academic performance was found in the early years. After 1968, Reading-Skills-Centers children were found to excel comparison groups in phonic skills and reading comprehension as measured by the

Botel Test and IRI, respectively. Trend analysis favored those pupils who had been in the project since its beginning. Longitudinal analysis showed that the downward trend of Vocabulary scores (of pupils with the greatest need in relation to the national pupil norms) was reversed after two years in the project, and the downward trend of their Reading Comprehension scores was reversed after one year in the project.

Annual test scores in the shared-time project showed that reading levels continued to improve for both public and parochial school pupils. Of the shared-time pupils in the public schools, 60% gained one book level or less in a year, 25% gained two book levels, and 15% gained three or more book levels. Of the nonpublic school pupils in the project, 61% gained at the rate of one book level or less, 21% gained two book levels, and 18% gained three or more book levels.

The amount of gain in reading achievement in terms of word-attack skills, vocabulary, and comprehension skills indicated that both parts of the project were producing positive pupil effects on both short-term and long-term bases.

1973-1974 The pretest and posttest scores of 1,446 pupils on the IRI were studied in relation to participation in the program for one, two, or three years. More than 50% of all the pupils gained the skills of two book levels or more: first-year pupils (66%) and third-year pupils (60%) attained the 60% objective. More than 75% of all pupils had gained the skills of one book level or more, but only third-year pupils (88%) came close to the 90% criterion.

Seventy-two percent of 236 pupils enrolled in the project for three years achieved mastery of 80% of the 64 items in the phonics test, indicating the effectiveness of the project in teaching children to hear and identify the sounds of consonants, blends, and vowels.

Almost 25% of each of three groups (first-, second-, and third-year participants, respectively) were able to gain phonics mastery.

1974-1975 During three or more instructional sessions per week for a year, teachers were able to help three of every 10 pupils to gain 90% mastery of phonics skills, and to help three of every 10 to improve their phonics skills by 20%. Fifty-six percent of the pupils were able to gain two book levels on informal reading inventories.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) This long-established and well-run project continues to operate according to expectations.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1:	Belmont, Mitchell, Washington
District 2:	Martin, Smith
District 3:	Hawthorne, Key
District 4:	Blankenburg, Kenderton, Peirce
District 5:	Clymer, Moffet
District 6:	Emlen, Wister
District 7:	Bethune, Smedley
Nonpublic:	Most Blessed Sacrament, St. Gregory, St. Rita

IMPROVEMENT OF READING SKILLS "C"
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Charles McLaughlin
HEADQUARTERS: 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue
TELEPHONE: BA 5-1914
PBRS CODE: 611-06-718
OPERATING YEARS: 1968-1976
GRADES SERVED: 2-8
NO. OF PUPILS: Nonpublic 1,360
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 34
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 36, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $235,000, Summer None, Total $235,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Marion Kaplan, Larry Aniloff*, Camilla Grigsby

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

IRS seeks to improve reading performance in word-attack, comprehension, and reference skills. In addition, positive attitudes toward reading are viewed as an important component. Nonpublic school pupils in Grades 2-8 visit reading-skills centers three to five times a week. The accent of the centers is on providing sufficient hardware, software, and individualized instructional materials which are designed to meet the specific needs of each pupil.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Comparisons of growth in reading comprehension, word-attack skills, and phonics.

KEY FINDINGS

1968-1973 Through monitoring and the collection of reading scores, it was determined that the project was well implemented and was improving pupils' reading levels. The teachers worked well with the parochial school schedules and special needs, and were well received.

Nine percent of the 1,176 pupils tested made no gains in book level, and 25% gained one level. Mastery (two or more book levels gained) was achieved by 66% of the pupils.

In order to assess specific decoding skills, project staff also administered a phonics inventory to all pupils. Analysis of a random sample of 276 pupils' scores indicated that the average gain in Grade 3 was 17.8 points,

Grade 4 15.8 points, Grade 5 12.6 points, and Grade 6 9.5 points. All of these gains were statistically significant.

1973-1974 In reading achievement, although only 88% (not the expected 90%) of the pupils gained at least one book level, 63% (more than the expected 60%) gained at least two book levels in a year's time. The criterion for phonics mastery (a 20-point gain in the percentage of pupils attaining mastery) was exceeded by a margin of 22 percentage points.

1974-1975 In reading achievement, 95% of the pupils (more than the stated objective of 90%) gained at least one book level, and 76% (more than the expected 60%) gained at least two book levels in a year's time. The criterion for phonics mastery (a 20-point gain in the percentage of pupils attaining mastery) also was exceeded; there was a gain of 53 percentage points.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The Reading Skills "C" project is operational in all of its locations. Project teachers are attempting to achieve the objectives by grouping pupils according to reading needs and by providing additional remedial instruction for those who need special help. Because this year's pretest scores and operational procedures are similar to those of previous years, it appears that the project will again be successful.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Nonpublic: Immaculate Conception B, Most Blessed Sacrament, Most Precious Blood, Our Lady of Holy Souls, Our Lady of Mercy, Our Lady of Rosary, Our Lady of Victory, Our Mother of Sorrows, Sacred Heart, St. Agatha, St. Anne, St. Anthony, St. Bonaventure, St. Boniface, St. Bridget, St. Carthage, St. Edward, St. Elizabeth, St. Francis de Sales, St. Francis Xavier, St. Gabriel, St. Madeline Sophie, St. Malachy, St. Mary Eternal, St. Michael, St. Paul, St. Peter Apostle, St. Peter Claver, St. Philip Neri, St. Rose of Lima, St. Veronica, St. Vincent de Paul, Transfiguration, Visitation

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION CENTER
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Charles McLaughlin
HEADQUARTERS: 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue
TELEPHONE: BA 5-1914
PBRS CODE: 611-06-733
OPERATING YEARS: 1968-1976
GRADES SERVED: 1-8
NO. OF PUPILS: 200
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 1
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 1, Paraprofessional 6, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $84,000, Summer None, Total $84,000
EVALUATION TEAM: William E. Loue III, Judith Green Leibovitz, Lisbeth Sorkin

---

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project activities provide a compensatory program for the children in the school which centers around the diagnosis and remediation of individual weaknesses in language arts and mathematics.

Instructional materials and multimedia equipment available in each classroom provide appropriate learning experiences for pupils according to their actual instructional levels. Additional supportive services to meet demonstrated needs include a full-time reading teacher, parent aides, an extensive tutoring program involving college students and upper-level IEC pupils, and certain other Title I projects.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Observational Checklist, Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, California Achievement Tests, and Pupil Opinionnaire.

KEY FINDINGS

1968-1973 Evaluation conducted internally by the coordinator of nonpublic school projects revealed that the enabling objectives were attained. Formative evaluation indicated that staff was hired and in-service programs were conducted.

Increasing individualization of instructional practices was evidenced by changes in class structure and teaching form in IEC classrooms. The individualization practices were observed in two half-year periods. Increased individualization occurred during the second half-year following the analysis of the midyear tests.

New extracurricular programs were introduced, and Grades 5-8 were reorganized to maximize the use of different forms of individualized instruction. Test results showed that the classes made gains paralleling national norms.

A longitudinal study of IEC students' ITBS Reading subtest results for 1970-1973 revealed that the average IEC student during that three-year period had improved in grade-equivalent score from year to year, and had maintained his/her relative standing with respect to national norms. (The latter required a gain of approximately seven months in GE score during each school year.) Students in IEC made educationally significant gains in the acquisition of basic academic skills. Moreover, the rates of gain for many of the students were substantially greater than the rates made by the norming population (comparable national sample of children).

1973-1974 On the ITBS Vocabulary subtest, gains in average score from June 1973 until March 1974 were sufficient to improve the national percentile rank for the pupils in Grades 4, 5, and 8. However, on the Reading subtest the corresponding national percentile rank did not improve in any grade.

On the Arithmetic Concepts subtest, gains in average score from June 1973 until March 1974 were sufficient to improve the national percentile rank for pupils in Grades 4 and 5. The corresponding gains in average score on the Arithmetic Problems subtest were sufficient to improve the national percentile rank only for pupils in Grade 5.

1974-1975 The IEC successfully implemented a compensatory program of individualized instruction to diagnose and remediate pupils' academic weaknesses. Pupils in most grades evidenced growth in basic academic skills by at least maintaining their national percentile rank on the standardized achievement test. IEC pupils also expressed generally positive attitudes toward themselves and their school experiences. The program appeared successful in the voluntary integration of children bussed from different neighborhoods within the city.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) It appears that the IEC's objective of individualizing instruction in the basic academic skill areas (mathematics and language arts) will be attained. Moreover, observations thus far support the probable attainment of the project's other objectives.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Nonpublic: St. Mary Interparochial

INTENSIVE READING FOR SECONDARY STUDENTS
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR:	Philip Pitis and District Reading Managers
HEADQUARTERS:	Room 505 B, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7718
PBRS CODE:	611-18-579
OPERATING YEARS:	1975-1976
GRADES SERVED:	7-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	35,638
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	37
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 228, Paraprofessional 11, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $2,303,015, Summer None, Total $2,303,015
EVALUATION TEAM:	Louis Scheiner and District Research Associates

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Administrators and their staffs in each district developed plans to intensify the instructional program in reading in order to improve reading skills of pupils attending Title I schools. Diagnostic tests are given to the students served by this project to identify specific skill deficiencies. Teaching personnel then develop individual instructional programs designed to remedy those deficiencies.

Every secondary student who had no California Achievement Tests (CAT) score from the 1974-1975 school year was to be tested with a group informal reading inventory and appropriately placed in an instructional group as stipulated in the court order of August 4, 1975.

Each school is to have at least one paraprofessional to assist in its preplanned program.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Year-to-year growth in reading comprehension and vocabulary skills is determined from annual CAT scores. State auditors visit the schools to verify compliance with the court order.

KEY FINDINGS

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) State evaluators that visited and monitored the schools reported that all secondary schools named in the court order*

have fully met the major provisions of the order. By October 1, 1975, junior high and senior high students below the 16th percentile on the CAT were grouped in classes of 15 and received the specified additional five or three periods of reading instruction per week. Students at the 16th through 32nd percentiles were grouped in classes of 20 and received the specified additional five or three periods of reading instruction per week. Students with no 1975 CAT scores were tested with a group IRI and then placed appropriately.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1:	Bartram, Lea, Sayre, Shaw, Sulzberger, Tilden, University City, West Philadelphia
District 2:	Audenried, Barratt, Franklin Sr. High, Franklin Learning Center, Penn, Vare, Vaux
District 3:	Bartlett, Bok, Furness, South Philadelphia, Stoddart-Fleisher
District 4:	Dobbins, FitzSimons, Gillespie, Gratz, Rhodes, Shoemaker, Strawberry Mansion
District 5:	Edison, Jones, Kensington, Penn Treaty, Stetson, Wanamaker
District 6:	Pickett, Roosevelt
District 7:	Cooke, Pennsylvania Advancement

LANGUAGE ARTS READING CAMPS
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Marjorie Farmer
HEADQUARTERS: Room 322, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE: 299-7787
PBRS CODE: 611-02-660
OPERATING YEARS: 1968-1976 (Summer 1976 not yet reportable)
GRADES SERVED: K-12
NO. OF PUPILS: 1,800
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 17 Camp Sites
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 36, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular None, Summer $29,000, Total $29,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Thomas J. Clark, Ethel K. Goldberg, William F. Haggett*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Language Arts Reading Camps use informal day-camp settings and activities to extend and supplement children's competencies in language arts.

Each camp follows an organized schedule of activities focusing on language-arts activities such as word games, free reading, book discussions, and creative writing. Children participate individually and in groups. In a camp atmosphere, they are encouraged to enjoy using all language skills (oral, aural, and written).

The camps are operated by settlement houses and housing developments with the School District of Philadelphia providing the language-arts component. The camp staff includes a director, a professional teacher, teenaged counselors, and Temple University Veterans in Public Service (VIPS). The teacher conducts separate language-arts activities with the campers and also instructs the counselors in how to incorporate language arts into all camp activities.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Questionnaires, interviews, observational checklists, pupil rating scales, and actual pupil projects.

KEY FINDINGS

1968-1973 The first evaluation revealed a need for more intensive counselor orientation. Workshops designed to fully acquaint staff with LARC goals were needed. Inconsistencies in record keeping caused difficulties in assessing impact of project on children. As a result, the project's emphasis on staff orientation was increased.

The project was successful in maintaining and increasing the motivation and interests of children in developing language-arts skills. Children of various ethnic groups, ranging from the age of five to early teens, volunteered for and attended the program on a regular basis (73%) over a five-week period during the summer. The children and the LARC staff felt that the experience was meaningful and profitable. The elements of the language-arts program were well integrated into the camp activities; the children successfully used the materials of the learning situation; and the children and LARC staff wanted to participate in the program again.

Teachers found that the children showed an increased use of their lending libraries, an increased eagerness to read books, and more active participation in group discussion. Some teachers indicated that the children showed improvement in speech patterns, pronunciation and recognition of short vowels and consonants, and written composition skills. Some teachers found also that children showed improved leadership qualities, increased ability to follow directions, and a tendency to volunteer to do additional work at home.

1974 On a project-specific checklist, the LARC staff reported that the participants submitted 1,880 articles for the camp newspapers (an average of two articles per pupil) during the course of the summer. The evaluation team developed a measure of children's writing ability using as an index the number of words and sentences written. The measure was administered as pretest and posttest by the LARC teachers to 84 children selected across grade levels. The results revealed a significant average gain ($p<.01$) of 36 words (five sentences) used per pupil.

1975 The absence of the Temple University teacher interns was evident this year; less intensive small-group and individual work took place. The effectiveness of the on-site camp-staff orientation and development was noted; however, a more intensive ongoing staff-development program might have complemented this. Most of the Youth Corps counselors were effective in dealing with the pupils; continuous monitoring of their performance by camp directors, and better-defined procedures for their selection, were suggested for the next year. It was noted that emphasis in the publication of newspapers might be switched from quantity to quality if the number of publications were limited to one every two weeks rather than one per week.

PARTICIPATING CENTERS

Abbotsford, 3235-F McMichael Street, 19129 (VI 8-6606)
Germantown Settlement, 324 High Street, 19144 (VI 9-7288)
Haddington Homes, 5520 Vine Street, 19139 (SH 7-4464)

Harrison Plaza, 1350 N. 10th Street, 19122 (CE 5-6500)
Harrowgate, 3561 Kensington Avenue, 19134 (PI 4-6555)
Haverford Community Center, 631 N. 39th Street, 19104 (EV 6-3301)
Hawthorne "Dig-a-Book" Day Camp, United Communities, Ridgeway Center, Broad & Christian, 19147 (FU 9-4120)
Houston Community Center, 2029 S. 8th Street, 19148 (HO 7-8700)
Millcreek Housing Development, 751 N. 46th Street, 19139 (EV 2-5234)
Norris Homes, 1915 N. 11th Street, 19122 (684-3982)
North Central Area YWCA, 1517 W. Girard Avenue, 19130 (PO 9-4040)
North Light Boys Club, 175 Green Lane, 19127 (IV 3-4800)
Philadelphia Housing Scatter Site, 1902 Mt. Vernon Street, 19122 (PO 3-0223)
Spring Garden Project, 715 Brandywine Street, 19123 (WA 3-4563)
Westpark Housing Development, Social Service Office, Apartment 305, 4445 Holden Street, 19104 (EV 7-2430)
Wharton Center and Strawberry Mansion Day Camp, 2137 N. 33rd Street, 19121 (CE 6-1217)
Wilson Park Homes, 2500 Jackson Street, 19145 (271-7386)

OPERATION INDIVIDUAL
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Charles McLaughlin
HEADQUARTERS: 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue
TELEPHONE: BA 5-1914
PBRS CODE: 611-06-502
OPERATING YEARS: 1972-1976
GRADES SERVED: 9
NO. OF PUPILS: Nonpublic 525
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 3
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 2, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $89,000, Summer None, Total $89,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Marion Kaplan, Larry Aniloff*, Camilla Grigsby

---

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Operation Individual is designed to provide underachieving ninth- and tenth-grade students with intensive, supervised aid in developing reading and study skills. Students were selected for participation in the project on the basis of the following criteria, as indicated by school records: low reading level, low scores on a high school placement test, inadequate study skills, and/or low school achievement.

The project has two major components: supportive reading service and intensive service. Students receiving only the supportive reading service have daily reading instruction provided by a reading teacher with individual or small-group assistance from an aide as the need arises. Students receiving intensive service are assigned to special Operation Individual block-rostered classes in social studies, mathematics, English, and (in one school) science, with an aide in each classroom. In addition, the intensive-service students have daily reading instruction provided by a reading teacher with individual or small-group assistance from an aide as the need arises.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Observations, interviews, and analysis of student progress in reading, study skills, and (for students receiving intensive service) the other subject areas.

KEY FINDINGS

1972-1973 The Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED) battery was completed by 135 ninth-grade project students providing both October pretest and May posttest information. However, because the project did not become

operational until midyear, the test results could be attributed to many variables possibly intervening prior to the project's inception. The composite test results revealed that 65% of the participating students improved their national percentile rank, 3% maintained the same rank, and 32% effected a loss in rank. The average participating student advanced from the national 14th percentile to the national 16th percentile between the pretest and the posttest.

1973-1974 While the project did not fully attain its academic objectives, nearly half the students did demonstrate seven months' gain in GE scores in a period of seven months on the Total Reading and Reference Skills subtests of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. On the programmed materials provided by the project, in two of the four subject areas (social studies and science) approximately three fourths of the students advanced one grade level in one academic year.

There were no changes in self-concepts or school-related attitudes as measured by a semantic differential survey.

1974-1975 Gains in GE score on the Total Reading and Reference Skills sections of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills indicated that the project did not attain its objective of improving the students' reading skills, but it did virtually attain its objective of improving their ability to use reference materials. Teacher ratings of the students' classroom achievement on skill records indicated that the students were showing progress in developing the skills necessary for learning the content material of English, science, mathematics, and social studies. Comparison of scores on the School Sentiment Index (Secondary Level) indicated no significant difference in school-related attitudes between participating and nonparticipating students.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Intensively supervised instruction in all Operation Individual subjects, along with daily reading instruction, should, in most cases, lead to increased levels of achievement in reading and study skills. Students who receive intensive service from the project should improve their performance in the various subject areas also.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Nonpublic: Hallahan, West Catholic Boys, West Catholic Girls .

PRIMARY READING SKILLS CENTERS
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Charles McLaughlin
HEADQUARTERS: 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue
TELEPHONE: BA 5-1914
PBRS CODE: 611-06-719
OPERATING YEARS: 1969-1976
GRADES SERVED: 1-4
NO. OF PUPILS: Nonpublic 230
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 2
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 2, Paraprofessional 2, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $45,000, Summer None, Total $45,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Thomas J. Clark, Ethel K. Goldberg, William F. Haggett*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Children in Grades 1-4 in participating schools are pretested for diagnosis of individual weaknesses and selection for participation in the project. During the week those selected meet with the reading teacher on a schedule of two to five one-hour sessions per week in groups of 5-15 children for individualized activities prescribed by the reading and classroom teachers and selected to meet individual weaknesses in basic reading skills.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Observations, Botel Phonics Inventory, Informal Reading Inventory, Alphabet Recognition Test, and the California Achievement Tests' Reading Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension sections.

KEY FINDINGS

1969-1973 Pupils showed statistically significant gains in both comprehension and vocabulary as measured by the California Achievement Test. Improved word-attack skills were indicated by the increasing percentage of pupils who attained raw scores of at least 45 on the Botel Phonics Inventory.

A group informal reading inventory was administered to 43 participating pupils in Grades 2-4 at the beginning and end of the school year. Ten (23%) of those pupils gained one book level or less, 11 (26%) gained two levels, and 22 (51%) gained three or more book

levels during the academic year. Thus 77% of the participating pupils attained or exceeded the goal of gaining two instructional book levels per year.

Approximately half of the project participants attained the desired mastery of alphabet or phonics skills.

On the CAT-70 Reading Comprehension subtest, average GE scores were as follows: Grade 1--0.8; Grade 2--1.5; Grade 3--3.1; Grade 4--3.8. Discrepancies from national norms ranged from 0.7 to 1.0. Although all grades demonstrated annual gains, only Grade 3 demonstrated a consistent decrease in discrepancy from national norms over the years.

1973-1974 Eighty-six percent (not the expected 90%) of the pupils at the original center gained at least one book level on the IRI; 68% (more than the expected 60%) gained at least two levels.

From pretest to posttest on the Botel Phonics Inventory, there was an increase of 42 points (more than the expected 20 points) in the percentage of pupils attaining mastery. At the end of the school year, the 14 pupils in Grade 1 at the original center were given a 52-item alphabet-recognition test; 11 pupils (79%) achieved at least a 95% mastery score (50 or more correct). Thus the project's objective regarding word-attack skills was partially attained; gains on the Botel Phonics Inventory in Grades 2-4 exceeded the expectation, but the first graders' alphabet-recognition mastery rate fell short of the expected 95%.

1974-1975 On the whole, pupils participating in the project showed gains in reading ability. The instructional reading levels of 70% of the Primary Reading Skills Centers pupils increased at least two book levels in a year's time; 90% of the pupils improved by at least one book level during the same period. The criterion for phonics mastery (a 20-point gain in the percentage of pupils achieving mastery) was exceeded by a considerable margin. While most pupils demonstrated gains in specific skill areas (reading comprehension, alphabet recognition, and vocabulary) not all of the criteria for these skills were met.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The Primary Reading Skills Centers project is fully operational in both centers. Although using different styles, both centers are providing experiences which should develop specific decoding and comprehension skills in primary-grade pupils who have reading difficulties.*

It appears that the project will be able to meet its objectives, as in previous years.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Nonpublic: St. Columba, St. Stephen

READING IMPROVEMENT THROUGH TEACHER EDUCATION
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Charles McLaughlin
HEADQUARTERS: 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue
TELEPHONE: BA 5-1914
PBRS CODE: 611-06-537
OPERATING YEARS: 1972-1976
GRADES SERVED: K-6
NO. OF PUPILS: In-service staff-development project for 294 teachers
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 33
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 11, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 1
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $185,000, Summer None, Total $185,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Marion Kaplan, Larry Aniloff, Camilla Grigsby

---

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project entitled Reading Improvement through Teacher Education (RITE-B) has evolved as a result of the apparent lack of experience of urban school teachers with specific reading techniques and materials designed to correct the weaknesses of urban school children relative to formal reading readiness. The project is designed, therefore, to improve teachers' skills in all phases of reading instruction.

RITE seeks to bring immediate practical help to teachers in diagnosing existing reading problems and designing and implementing effective developmental reading programs. Reading-area specialists serve as instructors, trainers, and helpers for the project teachers.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Observational instruments and the RITE Case Study are administered in fall and spring to assess the effect of the project's services on specific teacher competencies. Project records are monitored to assess the delivery of services.

KEY FINDINGS

1972-1973 As of the middle of the school year, three specialists had conducted 295 conferences, 8 workshops, 70 observations, and 31 demonstrations, for a total of 404 contacts with classroom teachers. A 20-item summated rating scale completed by principals of the participating schools indicated a generally high level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the specialists and the project as a whole. An informal solicitation of teacher attitudes toward the project revealed a high level of satisfaction and a desire for even more assistance.

1973-1974 Taken together, the RITE objectives depict an ideal reading-instruction situation. Within the framework of these objectives, the RITE specialists provided a wide variety of services to a large number of teachers. These services were delivered on a needs basis and with varying degrees of intensity. There was indication that teachers receiving these services managed their reading lessons effectively, and that they implemented the various phases of the DRA. At least at the primary-grade level, teachers also seemed able to make use of test results in their teaching of reading. However, there was less evidence of progress toward development of the teachers' abilities to individualize reading instruction.

1974-1975 The results of pretraining and posttraining classroom observations and administration of the RITE Case Study indicated that two of the project's objectives were fully attained and two were partially attained. The project's areas of greatest success with new teachers were directed-reading-activity implementation and reading-lesson management. There was also some evidence of success in developing the beginning teachers' skills in diagnosing and prescribing for individuals and in providing varied and individualized independent activities as a part of the basic reading program.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) RITE specialists provided a variety of services to a large number of teachers. Observation of the kindergarten teachers indicated that this component has been well received and has effected some changes in the classroom.*

Overall, the project is delivering the kinds of services that are appropriate to increasing teacher competence in the teaching of reading, and it should be successful in meeting its objectives.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Nonpublic: Cathedral, Corpus Christi, Immaculate Conception A, Immaculate Conception B, Most Blessed Sacrament, Most Precious Blood, Our Lady of Holy Souls, Our Lady of Mercy, Our Lady of the Rosary, Our Lady of Victory, Our Mother of Sorrows, Sacred Heart, St. Agatha, St. Anne, St. Bonaventure, St. Bridget, St. Carthage, St. Charles, St. Columba, St. Elizabeth, St. Francis Xavier, St. Gabriel, St. Madeleine Sophie, St. Malachy, St. Mary of the Eternal, St. Michael, St. Paul, St. Peter the Apostle, St. Peter Claver, St. Rita, St. Vincent de Paul, Transfiguration, Visitation

SUMMER READING READINESS
(A Component of the COMPREHENSIVE READING PROJECT)

ADMINISTRATOR: Charles McLaughlin
HEADQUARTERS: 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue
TELEPHONE: BA 5-1914
PBRS CODE: 611-06-651
OPERATING YEARS: 1972-1976 (Summer 1976 not yet reportable)
GRADES SERVED: K-1
NO. OF PUPILS: 2,000
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 40
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 155, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular None, Summer $94,000, Total $94,000
EVALUATION TEAM: William E. Loue III, Judith Green Leibovitz, Lisbeth Sorkin

---

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project provides preenrollment children with experiences designed to meet the demands of a structured first-grade reading program. Units of 40 children each are assigned to the supervision of a teacher who provides these experiences and activities. It is believed that this will increase pupil confidence in meeting the tasks required in learning to read.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Philadelphia Reading Readiness Test, Stanford Early School Achievement Test, Diagnostic Profile, Sight Word List.

KEY FINDINGS

1972-1973 Two hundred twenty-six project children (approximately 10% of the total population of pre-first-grade children) were randomly selected to provide pretest and posttest scores on the Philadelphia Readiness Test. One hundred sixty-three children completed both test administrations, obtaining a mean pretest score of 21.5 (maximum score=27) and a mean posttest score of 24.1. The difference (2.6) was statistically significant at the .05 level.

1974 A total of 1,003 pre-first-year pupils completed the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT). Seven hundred eighty-eight of the pupils attended at least 75% (21 half days) of the project sessions. Of these 788 pupils, 446 (56%) attained a mastery score of 18 items correct out of a possible 28 items on aural comprehension. It was expected that 60% of the pupils would achieve mastery; this objective was not completely attained. These results suggest further investi-

gation of the appropriateness of the mastery criterion of 18 items correct, which had been arbitrarily selected after an investigation of scores obtained by a comparable group of children.

The evaluation procedures were modified by the development and utilization of the Diagnostic Profile and a Sight Word List for each pupil. The Profile mapped out the basic reading-readiness skills required for success in a first-year reading program. The Word List included the 60 most common words found in the basal reading series used today. Pretest ratings on the Profile and Word List were provided by the first-year teachers; posttest ratings were recorded by the project teachers. Two hundred ninety-seven pupils attended at least 75% of the project sessions. One hundred ninety-three (64%) of those attained the mastery criterion. This proportion was below the expectation that 85% would attain mastery. However, it appeared that such an expectation was unreasonable for less than six weeks of half-day learning experiences.

1975 The project was implemented according to its intended mode of operation and attained each of its stated objectives: (a) improving the aural comprehension skills (abilities to pay attention to, organize, interpret, infer from, and retain what they heard) of pre-first-year children, and (b) developing the reading-readiness skills of under-achieving first-year children.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Nonpublic: Cathedral, Corpus Christi, Gesu, Immaculate Conception A, Immaculate Conception B, Most Blessed Sacrament, Most Precious Blood, Our Lady of Holy Souls, Our Lady of Mercy, Our Lady of Rosary, Our Lady of Victory, Sacred Heart, St. Agatha, St. Anne, St. Anthony, St. Bonaventure, St. Boniface, St. Bridget, St. Carthage, St. Charles, St. Columba, St. Edward, St. Elizabeth, St. Francis de Sales, St. Francis Xavier, St. Gabriel, St. Gregory, St. Madeleine Sophie, St. Malachy, St. Mary Eternal, St. Michael, St. Peter Apostle, St. Peter Claver, St. Philip Neri, St. Rita, St. Rose of Lima, St. Stephen, St. Veronica, Transfiguration, Visitation

COMPUTER-MANAGED INSTRUCTION

ADMINISTRATOR:	Sylvia Charp
HEADQUARTERS:	5th floor, Fifth and Luzerne Streets
TELEPHONE:	BA 9-9492
PBRS CODE:	611-24-846
OPERATING YEARS:	1966-1976 (Reorganized in 1974)
GRADES SERVED:	1-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	2,100
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	14
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 11, Paraprofessional 3, Clerical 3
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $295,000, Summer $51,000, Total $346,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Thomas J. Clark, Ethel K. Goldberg, William F. Haggett

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project was reorganized in 1974 from components of the Computer-Assisted Instruction, Instructional Management, and Teaching Basic Reading Skills projects, which were described in the 1974 edition of the Digest of Annual Evaluations (Report #7422). Its underlying educational philosophy recognizes that each individual is unique, that the education system should enable every individual to develop his full potential, and that a responsive education system should provide flexible learning alternatives.

The project's objectives are met by the development and implementation of a computer-assisted and computer-managed instruction system to diagnose, prescribe, test, and manage all the instructional activities for pupils in reading and mathematics, initially in Grades 1-3 and 7-12, and ultimately in Grades 1-12. The management system capitalizes on materials which have been developed for existing computer-managed instruction programs, and which have been found effective in past evaluations. Where necessary, original materials are written. Most of the prescriptions utilize instructional materials in several media currently available in the schools. Professional personnel identify, classify, and codify these materials which correlate with the respective competency objectives. The materials are prescribed to pupils on the basis of their diagnostic test results and their actual responses during instruction.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Data are gathered during the instructional and testing phases of the project. Comparisons of project and nonproject pupils' achievement are made where possible. Findings are used as bases for reports of pupil achievement and progress and for curriculum revision.

KEY FINDINGS

1966-1973 The initial years focused on obtaining hardware, recruiting staff, and developing software.

Comparisons of achievement-test results between pupils taught by CAI and by traditional methods were equivocal. In both reading and biology, CAI students tended to do slightly better than others; the differences, however, were not statistically significant.

A survey indicated that students liked working with CAI units, became bored less readily, and had only mild dissatisfaction with the system. Systems improved with additional technical support.

Study of relationship between pupil personality and achievement in CAI indicated that specific personality traits were not significant correlates of CAI achievement. It was concluded that CAI could be used with most pupils.

The CAI reading-comprehension course was selected, disseminated, and implemented in District 2. Approximately 2,000 children in Grades 4-12 participated; most of them achieved a year's increase in reading level during the academic year.

Changeover from Philco-Ford to Hewlett-Packard hardware had a substantial impact on the CAI program. The system availability increased from 82.5% to more than 99%. Computer reports showed that the CAI mathematics program provided successful learning experiences in mathematics for lower-achieving secondary students. The average student was able to complete more than 33 blocks of the program (24 blocks constituted one year's work), and averaged over 90% correct in the posttests of the blocks completed. Therefore, it was concluded that the Drill and Practice Mathematics program was successfully implemented as part of the CAI project.

1973-1974 The project was partially successful in implementing the intended mode of operation. While the CAI staff provided the specified services, individualization of instruction was not attained in the majority of CAI classes. Teachers indicated that difficulties stemmed from their inexperience with CAI and individualized instruction. Specifically, to develop off-line assignments related to each student's on-line instruction was considered impossible in classes of 30-35 students. Also, large classes limited student exposure to on-line instruction.

In spite of the limitations, the project was able to bring participating students to desired levels of mastery in remedial mathematics and biology. In addition, CAI students made greater gains than non-CAI students in reading as measured by the CAI Comprehension Test. Although differences between CAI and non-CAI students in mathematics and biology were not significant, teachers and administrators who were interviewed thought that the students profited not only from the individualized activities but also from the motivation associated with CAI.

1974-1975 The project was able to partially attain its objectives for the primary-grade reading centers. Although levels of mastery met expectations, project pupils did not exceed comparison groups on a phonics inventory or the CAT-70 Reading subtest. However, project pupils did exceed expected growth for the year as measured by informal reading inventories. Preliminary results on mathematics progress tests showed that participating pupils were mastering necessary mathematics skills.

Partial attainment of the objective to have pupils evidence mastery on the respective Reading Competencies Tests indicated a need for thorough examination of the on-line component (computer-assisted instruction). The project was able to provide effective instruction for pupils of all ability levels as shown by the 100% mastery rates on the criterion-referenced tests. Project teachers were observed fully individualizing instruction by May.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Computer-Managed Instruction has continued to provide teachers with a medium which makes possible individualized instruction at all levels. The primary-grade reading component is providing the participating pupils with instruction that leads to a high rate of success in the learning of reading skills. The secondary-grade reading component is operational and appears to be providing pupils with effective reading instruction. The primary-grade mathematics component was revised and is ready to be piloted. The mathematics and language-arts reinforcement centers are functioning as supplemental reading programs in most of the participating schools. This preliminary assessment indicates that the project should attain most of its objectives this year.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: University City
District 2: Vare, Peirce
District 3: Stoddart-Fleisher
District 4: Gratz, Lehigh, Rhodes, Strawberry Mansion
District 5: Penn Treaty, Wanamaker
District 6: Roosevelt
District 7: All Ages, Pennsylvania Advancement, Stearne

COUNSELING SERVICES

ADMINISTRATOR: Albert Bell
HEADQUARTERS: 9th floor, 219 N. Broad Street
TELEPHONE: 299-7431
PBRS CODE: 611-06-614
OPERATING YEARS: 1968-1976
GRADES SERVED: K-8
NO. OF PUPILS: 6,062
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 14
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 20, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 2
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $355,000, Summer $69,000, Total $424,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Marion Kaplan, Larry Aniloff, Camilla Grigsby

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Counseling Services project offers and provides a variety of services and programs to Title I elementary schools located in some of Philadelphia's most impoverished neighborhoods. Its focus is upon prevention rather than treatment. This means that most of the work done in schools by the project's staff is directed toward "normal" children, rather than "disturbed" children. Most of the project's activities are designed primarily to enhance the effect which teachers and parents have upon children in kindergarten through Grade 3.

Specifically, the work of the staff is "system oriented"; that is, it is designed to enrich different spheres of the child's everyday life in order to facilitate his learning and emotional-social growth and development. For this reason, the project attempts to work closely with parents, teachers, and principals, because these individuals are such important components of the child's life. By sharing and demonstrating appropriate mental health principles and practices with such individuals, it is hoped that they will be better able to enhance the children's potential for positive growth and development.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Surveys, project logs, and interviews.

KEY FINDINGS

1968-1973 Formative evaluation revealed that the project had established itself in 14 nonpublic schools.

Faculty acceptance was found to be related to the principal's attitude toward the project. Eighty percent of teachers and principals considered

that the children had grown socially as a result of CSP small-group discussions. CSP had more than 590 pupils referred for service. In-service training was provided for each participating school.

In nearly every school, the CSP teams provided testing, counseling, and consulting services for those pupils with individual psychological problems. More than 80% of the interviewed school personnel expressed satisfaction with the help given these children by the CSP teams. Small-group discussions were conducted regularly in almost all classes in every school. While parental contact was difficult to establish in many schools, the CSP teams conducted individual interviews with parents, as needed, in all schools.

Beginning in 1972, the project was no longer restricted to the lower elementary grades but was available to all teachers who desired its services in any grade throughout the school, and the services provided by the project were dictated by the needs of each individual school instead of being implemented in a prescribed sequence as in previous years.

1973-1974 Statistical records compiled by CSP personnel revealed that more than 3,400 pupils (receiving more than 35 different types of services), 150 teachers, and 1,600 parents received preventive psychological services. The teams had more than 2,200 teacher consultations, more than 1,000 consultations with principals, and more than 600 contacts with outside resources.

The evaluator interviewed 147 pupils who were in classes participating in group activities. Of these, 99% knew who the counselors were, 97% said that they did things with them, 97% reported that they liked doing things with the counselors, 93% felt that the counselors helped them get along with other children, 87% felt that the counselors helped them do better in school, and 78% thought that the counselors helped their teachers.

According to the questionnaire responses of 156 teachers, the most beneficial preventive psychological services were teacher-education films and discussions, classroom consultations, parent-child orientation, and small-group discussions.

1974-1975 In all schools, the CSP teams fulfilled their responsibilities prerequisite to attainment of the project's objectives. CSP successfully met all of its stated objectives and was enthusiastically received by pupils, parents, and teachers. The data revealed that greater attention was needed in a few schools to keep the teachers informed about the counselor's activities in helping each child.

The initiation this year of the Diagnostic/Prescriptive Learning Therapy program by the project's reading specialist added a new dimension--that of enabling the counselors to diagnose, prescribe, and implement help for children with severe learning disabilities.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Considerable progress has been made toward all CSP objectives so far this year. It seems that more than the anticipated numbers of pupils, teachers, and parents will have received the various project services by the end of the year. The learning-therapy program has been implemented and is already serving more students than anticipated.*

Teachers and principals have received the project well and have expressed enthusiasm for all of the various services.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Nonpublic: Most Blessed Sacrament, Most Precious Blood, Our Lady of Holy Souls, Our Lady of the Rosary, Our Mother of Sorrows, Sacred Heart, St. Carthage, St. Elizabeth, St. Francis de Sales, St. Ignatius of Loyola, St. Mary, St. Rita, Transfiguration, Visitation BVM

CREATIVE DRAMATICS

ADMINISTRATOR: Harriet Ehrlich
HEADQUARTERS: E. W. Rhodes School
TELEPHONE: 221-5353
PBRS CODE: 611-02-548
OPERATING YEARS: 1966-1976
GRADES SERVED: K-12
NO. OF PUPILS: 2,500
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 22
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 2, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $41,000, Summer None, Total $41,000
EVALUATION TEAM: William E. Loue III, Judith Green Leibovitz*, Lisbeth Sorkin

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Creative Dramatics is designed to be an immediate cognitive and affective experience. Through the use of a sequentially learned technique, children are encouraged to explore the social, personal, and academic worlds of themselves and others--both real and imagined. The idea that differences are a function of individuality to be respected and appreciated is thoroughly explored.

Continuous staff development for Creative Dramatics teachers, through workshops, in-school supervision, and leadership-committee meetings, seeks to insure the growth of the program. The learned techniques of the program may be used as a stylized manner of teaching the curriculum or inserted during any part of the day as an adjunct to the regular instructional format. Through dramatization, role playing, and improvisation, each child is encouraged to use imagination to solve problems, to communicate through body movement, and to engage in self-expression. The pupils are directed to gain background information for their activities by research in related literature. Story-telling and reading assignments, correlated with a sense of the dramatic, are encouraged.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Systematic monitoring structured around a formalized Observational Checklist; interaction analysis; comparison with matched groups on achievement in basic skills (ITBS) and on creativity (Torrance test).

KEY FINDINGS

1966-1973 Interaction analysis showed that pupils in the project made more high-level, extended, and spontaneous contributions to their classes than pupils in comparison classes. Teachers in the project lectured less

often, lectured for shorter periods of time, and encouraged pupils to express themselves and participate in classroom activities more than did teachers not in the CD project.

Fifth-grade pupils in CD obtained significantly higher scores in language arts (ITBS) than matched comparison groups. When other grade levels were examined, Creative Dramatics teacher behaviors did not affect Iowa test scores. Creativity (Torrance) scores revealed no major differences between involved and non-involved pupils. However, after participating in the project, teachers incorporated the Creative Dramatics techniques into their teaching behaviors; thus, as primarily a staff-development program, the project was achieving its objectives.

A survey of workshop participants revealed that teachers favored the ideas, activities, materials, and techniques taught in the project. In addition, teachers reported carry-over of newly learned Creative Dramatics techniques to their classrooms, and dissemination to their colleagues.

Visits to CD workshops revealed that innovative techniques for teaching mathematics, science, and the language arts were being presented to project participants. Each observed workshop showed careful planning and virtually flawless execution. The enthusiasm, attentiveness, and involvement of the participants were rated excellent during all observations. Teacher attendance at workshops averaged 77%.

1973-1974 In almost all visits, evaluators observed that the CD teacher used nonverbal communication which stressed children's senses and encouraged character portrayal. Supervisors, when observed by the evaluators, were in the process of encouraging CD teachers to use more creative writing. Of the six CD components, five were fully applied by the CD teacher and the sixth, creative writing, was in the process of being implemented. In nearly all observation visits, evaluators observed CD teachers using at least three CD techniques.

1974-1975 The two objectives of the project were attained. Teachers were observed using CD techniques in the manner in which they were expected to be used, and as the year progressed students were seen expressing more academic ideas in pantomime and through verbalization. Respondents to a postworkshop questionnaire expressed enthusiasm.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The CD project has experienced some delays in implementation resulting from questions concerning the project's funding status. Moreover, the loss of supplementary funds from the various participating districts has necessitated*

the elimination of evening workshops and leadership meetings, two vital components of the project's operation in the past. Consequently, the project's services have been more concentrated with fewer teachers.

The objective related to the evaluation of writing skills required a pretest in October. The pretest has not been administered because of problems related to identification of eligible teachers. The project will attempt to attain this objective despite the much shorter period of time between the pretest and posttest. Moreover, delays in the implementation of the CD workshops may affect the results related to the implementation of CD activities in the classroom.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1:	Daroff, Hamilton (Brooks), Holmes, Lea, Walnut Center
District 2:	Arthur, Stanton
District 3:	All Ages, Meredith
District 4:	Blaine, Duckrey, Lehigh, Peirce, Walton, Wright
District 5:	Ludlow, Moffet, Sheppard, Thomas
District 6:	Dobson, Kelly
District 7:	All Ages

EDUCATION IN WORLD AFFAIRS

ADMINISTRATOR:	Margaret Lonzetta
HEADQUARTERS:	World Affairs Council, Wanamaker's, 13th and Market Streets
TELEPHONE:	LO 3-5363
PBRS CODE:	611-03-556
OPERATING YEARS:	1966-1976
GRADES SERVED:	6-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	Public 2,600, Nonpublic 400
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	79
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 2, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $124,000, Summer None, Total $124,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	William E. Loue III, Judith Green Leibovitz, Lisbeth Sorkin*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project, concentrating on the study of various issues and concepts each year, involves students in each of the seven districts having target-area schools. Materials appropriate to the grade level, including films, filmstrips, records, and books, are provided for every participating teacher. Participating students receive books and booklets relevant to each unit of study. Speakers from each country are sent into every classroom. Each class is invited to take trips to two cultural centers in the city for a lesson on one of the countries studied. Throughout the year, all classes have the opportunity to take a trip to New York where they tour the UN building and see other interesting points of the city. Twelfth-grade students also participate in regional conferences and visit Washington, D. C.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Comparative testing in specific content areas, measurement of attitudinal changes or open-mindedness toward countries studied, and observations of events.

KEY FINDINGS

1966-1973 Students in EWA demonstrated a significantly greater knowledge of the four countries studied than non-EWA students. Measures of open-mindedness showed that the ratings of EWA and non-EWA students were about the same.

EWA clubs visited the UN headquarters, heard tape recordings of indigenous speakers, and participated in extra- and interclub activities.

Systematic monitoring and teachers' responses to a questionnaire indicated that teachers used EWA booklets to prepare their students for country programs at the Civic Center and the Art Museum, used introductory tapes about the four countries, and had the students use the library for research.

Materials were available and activities occurred as planned, at the elementary, junior high, and senior high levels of the project. A six-week special education pilot program using EWA materials was well received by nine teachers who participated in an evaluation session.

1973-1974 Five classes of junior high students, randomly selected and tested with an instrument developed to test their knowledge of facts and information contained in the Mexico unit, showed statistically significant gains ($p<.05$) on the test.

Each of the enabling objectives was completely satisfied. Members of the evaluating team observed the activities, finding them well planned and efficiently conducted. Responses from questionnaires sent to class sponsors indicated that materials were received on schedule and that trips were conducted as planned (indicated by 90% of the returns).

Two parent-teacher conferences were provided for the teachers and parents of the eight special education classes. However, only 165 of the project's 280 parents attended. Although the attendance objective was not met, the purpose and needs of the program were. The evaluation team concluded that the program for the parents was successful.

1974-1975 This project gave participating students factual knowledge about peoples in other lands and about current world problems. Instruction was organized into manageable six-week units in which written material, charts, trips, and guest speakers provided a multifaceted approach. Elementary and junior high classes entertained other classes in their district with originally developed presentations at culminating activities. Test results indicated that both junior high and elementary students made statistically significant gains in knowledge. However, a test of cultural attitudes failed to show a significant difference between the EWA and comparison groups.

The planning sessions for participating teachers provided an opportunity for dissemination of information and informal sharing of ideas among teachers and project personnel. The culminating dinner conference for special education students gave parents an opportunity to see their children perform and to interact informally with the teachers and with one another.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The EWA project is fully operational at this time. All unit activities are proceeding on schedule. The newly written and revised booklets were printed before the August 1975 court order and have been reportedly more difficult for this year's EWA student population to read. The specially prepared Teacher's Guide was intended to help teachers deal with these reading deficits.*

As currently operating, the project should attain its stated objectives.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1:	Bartram, Belmont, Bryant, Comegys, Daroff, Hamilton, Huey, Locke, McMichael, Sayre, Sulzberger, University City, Washington, West Philadelphia, Wilson
District 2:	Audenried, Bache, Barratt, Bregy, Carver, Childs, Franklin, Kelley, Martin, Peirce, Penn, Vaux
District 3:	Bartlett, Bok, Jackson, Kearny, Key, South Philadelphia, Spring Garden, Washington
District 4:	Blaine, Blankenburg, Cleveland, Dobbins, FitzSimons, Gillespie, Gratz, Peirce, Pratt-Arnold, Rhodes, Shoemaker, Stokley
District 5:	Douglas, Dunbar, Edison, Ferguson, Jones, Kensington, Ludlow, McKinley, Moffet, Thomas, Wanamaker, Willard
District 6:	Dobson, East Falls, Mifflin, Pennell, Roosevelt, Steel, Widener
District 7:	Bethune, Pennsylvania Advancement, Stearne
Nonpublic:	Hallahan, Roman Catholic, St. Edward, St. Ignatius, St. Madeleine Sophie, St. Mary Interparochial, St. Rose of Lima, St. Stephen, West Catholic Boys, West Catholic Girls

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE--READINESS

ADMINISTRATOR: Charles McLaughlin
HEADQUARTERS: 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue
TELEPHONE: BA 5-1914
PBRS CODE: 611-06-504
OPERATING YEARS: 1971-1976
GRADES SERVED: Kindergarten
NO. OF PUPILS: Nonpublic 220
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 5
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 3, Paraprofessional 10, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $128,000, Summer None, Total $128,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Marion Kaplan, Larry Aniloff*, Camilla Grigsby

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project serves areas of concentration of immigrants from Puerto Rico with all the attendant effects of the poverty area on preschoolers complicated further by a lack of proficiency wi' English, the language of the school, resulting in low achievement in first grade and throughout the academic career, low expectations on the part of parents and teachers, negligible self-image, and high likelihood of early dropout.

Centers are established in schools with high percentages of Puerto Ricans. Each center is staffed by one teacher assisted by one or two bilingual aides (parents of pupils). Teachers are trained in working with language-development programs with a proven high degree of success in developing requisite skills in bilingual children. Classes meet in two half-day sessions at each center in an informal classroom setting.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Project monitoring, Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT), and Elementary School Speaking Tests in English and Spanish (ESST).

KEY FINDINGS

1971-1973 Experiences provided by the project appeared to have positive effects on pupil achievement as measured by the ESST and upon readiness for future academic work as measured by the PRT.

Approximately two thirds of the project's pupils developed sufficient readiness skills to attain scores at least equivalent to 90% mastery of

the items on the PRT. Average scores on the English section of the ESST increased significantly for both Anglo (pretest mean=37.5; posttest mean=46.6) and Spanish-speaking (pretest mean=32.9; posttest mean=44.8) pupils.

1973-1974 Fifty-seven percent of the pupils attained a score of 24 (85% mastery) or higher on the test which was administered in May. Because less than the expected 75% of the participating pupils achieved mastery, the project did not fully attain its objective of developing readiness skills.

On the English subtest of the Elementary School Speaking Test, the mean pretest score was 32.7; the mean posttest score was 43.7. With this gain statistically significant beyond the .05 level, the project achieved its objective of developing English language skills.

1974-1975 The pupils in the ESL-R project made significant gains in improving their English language skills as measured by the English subtest of the Elementary School Speaking Test. The project also attained its readiness-skills objective. The mastery score of 17 or higher on Part 4 (Aural Comprehension) of SESAT was achieved by 63% (more than the expected 60%) of the pupils.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The ESL-R project is operational in all five locations, attempting to achieve its objectives of developing English language and readiness skills. In an informal, small-group classroom, programs and methods which have been successful in the past are used to aid the pupils in developing these skills. The September 1975 pretest mean score (31.6) on the English section of the Elementary School Speaking Test was similar to the pretest mean score of 32.7 from both 1973 and 1974. The similarity to last year's program in terms of pretest scores and operational procedure suggests that the project is likely to attain its objectives again.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Nonpublic: Cathedral, St. Bonaventure, St. Boniface, St. Edward, St. Peter Apostle

ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

ADMINISTRATOR: Eleanor Sandstrom
HEADQUARTERS: Room 300, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE: 299-7791
PBRS CODE: 611-02-551
OPERATING YEARS: 1966-1976 (Originally English as a Second Language)
GRADES SERVED: PK-12
NO. OF PUPILS: 2,180
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 31
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 59, Paraprofessional 6. Clerical 2
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $831,000, Summer $25,000, Total $856,000
EVALUATION TEAM: Robert M. Offenberg, Bob Epstein, Carlos Rodriguez-Acosta

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The most widely accepted teaching procedures that reflect the philosophy and principles of applied linguistics are employed to attain the stated objectives of second-language acquisition. The organization for instruction takes several forms depending upon the organizational structure of the school, the needs of the children, and the number to be served. For example, in some schools the children are with the ESOL teacher in a self-contained classroom. In other schools the non-English-speaking children are sent by their classroom teacher to the ESOL teacher for instruction at intervals during the school day. In some schools the children have ESOL as an integral part of a bilingual learning experience.

First Stage: Aural/oral - The children listen, repeat, and use the different structures in answering questions in dialogues, in describing things, and in relating experiences.

Second Stage: Reading - The children read material based on oral experiences.

Third Stage: Writing - Given a word with which they are familiar, the pupils write a sentence. Given a theme or a picture, the children write a short story describing same.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Assessment of English competencies as measured by the Linguistic Capacity Index, subtests of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (Level I), Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, the locally developed Test of Aural Comprehension, and the latest form of the locally developed ESOL Screening Test; comparisons of English-facility ratings made by ESOL and non-ESOL teachers; survey of community through questionnaires to report attitudes and involvement of the affected communities.

KEY FINDINGS

1966-1973 Responses to survey questionnaires indicated that most ESL pupils had made improvements in word pronunciation, speech patterns, fluency, and school adjustment. Parents, principals, and teachers reported that the ESL program had high value and was successfully meeting its objectives.

Variations in class sizes and hours of instruction existed from school to school. These variations affected the performance of some pupils as evidenced by their rating by non-ESL teachers.

Differential gains among schools were probably attributable to differences in grades served, and differences in instructional setting (e.g., the self-contained classroom versus part-time attendance in ESL classes). Although end-of-year scores for self-contained classes averaged about the same as end-of-year scores for part-time classes, pupils in self-contained classes made most of their gains during the first half-year, while pupils in part-time classes made more even gains over the entire school year. All groups made statistically significant gains on the Linguistic Capacity Index during their exposure to ESL. It was concluded that ESL was meeting its objective of increasing the pupils' English audiolingual skills.

Monitoring and teacher questionnaires revealed that the number of pupils taught by each teacher varied greatly from site to site. Instructional time was found to vary from one hour to 26 hours per week. Materials varied because many were teacher made, although most teachers of Grades 1-4 used the Lancaster series and most junior high and senior high teachers used Friese. The Lado series (two levels) was made available to teachers if they wanted to use it. Most teachers reported that the materials they had were adequate. In each school, teachers found that about two pupils entered and two left the project each month. The percentage of pupils who were in ESL for a second year was found to vary from 0% to 45% in the elementary schools, and from 3% to 93% in the junior and senior high schools. The Linguistic Capacity Index was judged to be inadequate even in a revised form, and its use for evaluating was discontinued in 1972.

The Observational Checklist with additional ESL specifications was used in monitoring all sites. In 50% of the cases, English was used exclusively during the class periods. Colloquial expressions were being used in 17 instances, and students were learning to discriminate among sounds in 15 of the 24 observations made. Children followed spoken English directions regarding class activities, projects, and assignments. Instructional tapes and records were in English. Thus the curriculum was structurally

organized to emphasize the use of English, with materials and methods essential to the understanding of spoken English intensively incorporated on a continuous basis.

Observations and records indicated that 27% of the participants were advanced pupils learning to read, to write, and to refine grammar in English. Although the greater numbers of advanced students were reported by junior high school teachers, aural/oral skills were still the most heavily stressed. At one third of the sites, pupils were involved in silent reading. The observed "writing" activities involved pupils marking a picture or an answer, or using colored pencils to draw, rather than writing structured English compositions. Observations established that reading and writing in various forms were taking place in the program at both intermediate and advanced levels.

1973-1974 Tests administered to a sample of pupils showed that pupils in the project for more than a year and a half had greater comprehension of spoken and written English than those with less experience in the project. This was true regardless of the pupils' age, grade, or length of time on the mainland.

1974-1975 During this year the project staff made major efforts in solving the problems of identifying all students in the Philadelphia public and nonpublic school systems who were in need of ESOL services, and in measuring ESOL students' growth. A screening test was developed and used in making decisions about more than 4,700 pupils in order to identify those who needed ESOL, and two forms of a test of aural comprehension were developed which, with minor revisions, can be used for pretesting and posttesting. Analysis of the 1975 aural comprehension scores indicated that substantial amounts of the students' English competence could be attributed to the length of time they were in ESOL.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The Test of Aural Comprehension to be administered in March is currently being printed on a machine-scorable form.*

Baseline data on the ESOL Screening Test have already been collected for comparison with posttest results.

Utilization of last year's screening information has been completed. The computer file is being revised to include results of the Fall 1975 screening of pupils and to develop a system which will allow long-term follow-up of pupils served by the project.

Formalization of the procedures used in determining when participating pupils no longer need ESOL was not completed by the specified

December date. Efforts are underway to establish these criteria, but it has become clear that the issues raised are manifold and complex.

The services being provided to participating pupils appear to reflect the intent of the project.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 2:	Franklin, Penn, Waring
District 3:	South Philadelphia, Southwark, Stoddart-Fleisher
District 5:	Edison, Ferguson, Hunter, Jones, Kensington, Ludlow, McKinley, Miller, Moffet, Penn Treaty, Potter-Thomas, Sheppard, Stetson, Wanamaker
District 7:	Pennsylvania Advancement, Taylor
Nonpublic:	Cathedral, Hallahan, Roman Catholic, St. Bonaventure, St. Boniface, St. Edward, St. Peter Apostle, St. Stephen, St. Veronica

EPISCOPAL ACADEMY: SUMMER ENRICHMENT

ADMINISTRATOR:	James W. Straub
HEADQUARTERS:	Episcopal Academy, Latches Lane, Merion, Pa.
TELEPHONE:	TE 9-3100
PBRS CODE:	611-02-519
OPERATING YEARS:	1973-1976 (Summer 1976 not yet reportable)
GRADES SERVED:	Grade 6
NO. OF PUPILS:	32
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	1
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 0, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0 (Personnel provided by Episcopal Academy)
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular None, Summer Pending
EVALUATION TEAM:	Thomas J. Clark, Ethel K. Goldberg*, William F. Haggett

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In a suburban private school campus setting, Title-I-eligible children participate in an intellectual and physical summer enrichment program. Six days a week, they are transported by bus from their Title I schools to the Episcopal Academy for five weeks of academic and athletic instruction.

The morning program consists of five 25-minute classes in reading, mathematics, history, science, and art in a daily alternating order. Four ability-based class groups are subdivided so that individual pupils can be guided and tutored by the teacher and two paraprofessional assistants (juniors and seniors from the academy's regular program) in each class.

The reading curriculum, centered on a synchronized tape-cassette and booklet program, is designed to encourage audiovisual word recognition. The history program also concentrates on developing written and oral communication skills through library work.

The mathematics program involves the use of various instructional strategies to teach multiplication and division. In science classes the teacher emphasizes hands-on, experiential scientific activities to communicate basic anatomy and biochemistry facts.

The art program, designed to expose children to a limited variety of art media through which they can express their creative abilities, focuses primarily on the molding or sculpting of clay objects, which the participants glaze, fire, and take home.

After morning classes the children eat a free lunch at a local restaurant and return to the academy for athletic games, sports, and swimming instruction emphasizing good sportsmanship and cooperation. They also participate in educationally relevant, science-oriented field trips.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Evaluator observations, descriptions and narrative summaries provided by the project staff, Stanford Achievement Test, and Red Cross swimming tests are used to measure the attainment of project goals.

KEY FINDINGS

1974 This summer project provided a program of academic subjects and sport activities for target-area children in a private school setting. The project was successful with respect to both its goals. Participants improved in both of the academic subject areas and in athletic proficiency. The average pupil increased his reading score on the Stanford Achievement Test by 1.1 GE and his mathematics score by 0.8 GE. In addition, 27 of 31 children made excellent progress in swimming.

1975 Competently organized and operated by an enthusiastic, socially-concerned, well-prepared, and understanding director and staff, the project successfully gave inner-city sixth-grade boys a chance to explore their individual interests and develop special abilities and talents. In a well-equipped and aesthetically attractive suburban private school milieu, 32 economically disadvantaged boys participated in a variety of instructional and recreational activities designed to remedy specific basic skill deficiencies, stimulate academic inquiry and achievement, and develop athletic ability.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Episcopal Academy

FOLLOW THROUGH (ESEA TITLE I COMPONENT)

ADMINISTRATOR:	Leontine Scott
HEADQUARTERS:	Room 510, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7659
PBRS CODE:	611-01(02)-699, 611-01(02)-511, 611-14-748
OPERATING YEARS:	1968-1976
GRADES SERVED:	K-4
NO. OF PUPILS:	13,161
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	44
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 116, Paraprofessional 419, Clerical 11
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $5,119,000, Summer $335,000, Total $5,454,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Thomas McNamara, Judith Goodwin, James Welsh, Anne Lukshus, Janice Atkins

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Follow Through was designed to continue and augment the gains made in Head Start, once the children enter the formal school. It aims to improve the scholastic achievement of children by providing comprehensive compensatory services, particularly in reading skills (word recognition, word analysis, comprehension), oral communication, written expression, and listening skills.

The program brings together the resources of the school, community, and family in a replete approach to meet the child's needs. Services include a special program of instruction, nutrition programs for the children and the parents, supplemental health services (medical, dental, psychological), additional social services, and continuous in-service training.

Teams are trained to work with children and parents. Constant planning is built into regular activities. Model-management teams involve persons at district, school, and community levels to implement the program more effectively. In-service training for administrators, staff, and parents also is provided.

Seven planned variations of comprehensive services designed to improve scholastic achievement of pupils K-3 in basic skills are medical care, dental care, nutrition, social services, psychological services, teacher training, and active parent involvement.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Standardized achievement tests, questionnaire, Observational Checklist.

KEY FINDINGS

1968-1973 The first year witnessed many of the difficulties inherent in an attempt to plant innovative methods into a well established institution. The beginnings of the program found personnel resistant to change, hazy about what changes they were actually expected to bring about, and anxious about the outcomes. In many cases the philosophy and techniques appropriate to each model had to be learned on the job, since it was not known ahead of the school year which teachers were to participate in the program.

During the second and third years of the program, staff development was more carefully planned and included more parents. In addition, the model sponsors became more involved at the local level. Model liaisons, in conjunction with the on-site team leaders, served the key function of interpreting the instructional program at the local level and eventually became responsible for its dissemination.

From a concentration on implementation at the instructional level, the program was able to move more and more toward articulation. Dissemination occurred gradually. Both the EDC and Behavior Analysis models opened training centers in Philadelphia and began to involve personnel and parents from other schools and communities.

Of the 309 teachers assigned to Follow Through since 1968, only 75 were no longer teaching in the program in Spring 1972, representing a 76% holding rate. This was considered to be a highly satisfactory level of continuity of treatment.

Of a total of 8,037 pupils identified as having Follow Through exposure of at least five months' duration since 1968, slightly more than 70% had continued through Spring 1972. Those with Head Start or equivalent experience had continued at a higher rate (74-75%). These findings were considered to indicate that pupils enrolled in the program had remained over a sufficient amount of time to receive planned effects of the program.

In interviews and survey responses, all levels of program personnel and parents seemed to be highly convinced that the program should continue, and that its unique characteristics as an early childhood program were of benefit to the education of children in Philadelphia. The program elicited very few negative votes regarding its continuance, but did inspire a considerable number of suggestions for modifications in policies and procedures among upper-level personnel. Although the groups varied in their expression of changes desired, some common suggestions were changes in administrative and financial

procedures, more staff selectivity, changes in and/or combinations of models or model components, and better federal and other sponsor support, with better evaluation efforts at all levels.

Two of the seven models emerged as effective approaches to educational achievement across all grades (K-3), as measured by the 1972 citywide achievement tests, from both cross-sectional and quasi-longitudinal approaches. Most models compared favorably with appropriate reference groups in at least one of the four grade levels tested.

1973-1974 Overall, the project has functioned well and has evidenced progress toward uniform effectiveness in all its major components.

The Behavior Analysis model has evidenced the highest pupil achievement in all areas and at all grade levels, and has evidenced superior pupil performance in relation to comparison school groups. Program exposure and Head Start or equivalent experience seem to have had the most pronounced positive effect in this model.

The Bank Street model has rivaled the Behavior Analysis model in achievement of kindergarten and first-grade pupils, particularly under the conditions of maximum project exposure and Head Start or equivalent experience, but not in achievement of second- and third-grade pupils, particularly in reading.

In the project as a whole, maximum exposure and Head Start or equivalent experience have had a positive effect on mathematics and reading performance of kindergarten and first-grade pupils. However, there is now a broad spectrum of evidence indicating that second- and third-grade pupil performance in mathematics and reading was considerably below the level achieved in the earlier grades in 1972-1973.

All supportive services have shown improvement, but some sites still required increased effort in providing adequate social services and in establishing convenient means of transportation to the services.

Parent involvement continued to be a high priority area of the project and has consistently gained in effectiveness. However, there were still some sites where adequate concern was lacking.

1974-1975 In implementation of their respective instructional approaches, the Bank Street and Behavior Analysis Models continued at a high level, the EDC Model gained notably over previous years, and the Florida Parent Education, Parent Implemented, and Philadelphia Process

Models also showed some improvement. In two of the Bilingual Model's three schools, implementation was found to be adequate.

In reading and language achievement, the project as a whole, each model, and each district's Follow Through group showed percentile-rank gains over 1973-1974 performance. In mathematics, the sole exception to similar improvements was the Parent Implemented Model, whose 1973-1974 kindergarten data were not available. In all three skill areas, the Behavior Analysis and Parent Implemented Models and the District 4 Follow Through group showed significantly higher performance in 1974-1975 than did non-Follow-Through and total district reference groups in the same year. The Bank Street Model came close to equaling this accomplishment.

The parent-involvement component continued to be strong; in several schools, parent involvement was more successful than in previous years. However, in a few schools the component needed further attention.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The Behavior Analysis and Bank Street models continue to be the most consistently implemented in general, although there are some problems. The Philadelphia Process, Parent Implemented, and Bilingual models seem to be moving toward greater individualization of instruction. The EDC model is giving increased emphasis to basic skills. The Florida Parent model has undergone a change in staffing pattern that presently tends to reduce the number of home visits.*

The expansion program is reported as being well under way, with multiadult classrooms and a focus on individualized instruction among the various model options. Performance data will be available for the end-of-year report.

Although supportive service contracts were under way earlier this year than last, there have been many delays in negotiations, and increased personnel costs have affected the comprehensive delivery of services. However, there will be a greater effort this year to utilize other resources to supplement the funding of services; this should benefit the supportive health-service programs in the schools. The parent-involvement component is also well under way, with the exception of a few schools.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Belmont, Drew, Locke, McMichael, Rhoads, Washington, Wilson
District 2: Arthur, Carver, Meade, Reynolds, Stanton, Waring

District 3:	Hawthorne, Kearny, Nebinger, Southwark, Spring Garden, Wister
District 4:	Blankenburg, Dick, Duckrey, Pratt, Stanton, Stokley, Wright
District 5:	Dunbar, Elverson, Ferguson, Harrison, Hartranft, Hunter, Ludlow, McKinley, Moffet, Welsh
District 6:	East Falls, Fulton, Kelly, Pastorius, Wister
District 7:	Bethune, Smedley, Taylor

INSTITUTIONS FOR NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT CHILDREN

ADMINISTRATOR:	Lurlene Sweeting
HEADQUARTERS:	Room 204, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7842
PBRS CODE:	611-05-587, 611-05-588
OPERATING YEARS:	1968-1976
GRADES SERVED:	K-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	1,295
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	20 Institutions
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 2, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0 (Most personnel provided by respective institutions)
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $133,405, Summer $164,538, Total $297,943
EVALUATION TEAM:	William E. Loue III, Judith Green Leibovitz*, Lisbeth Sorkin

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project, developed cooperatively with representatives of Philadelphia public, private, and parochial institutions for neglected and delinquent children, involved planning and implementing programs designed to meet the special needs of institutionalized children. These children are referred to the various institutions by public and private agencies throughout the city of Philadelphia.

Title I funds are utilized to supplement the institutions' ongoing curriculum durin the regular and summer terms and after school hours. Examples of the programs offe in the institutions are reading/language arts, mathematics, cultural enrichment, science, tutoring, camping, educational field trips, diagnostic evaluation in reading and mathematics, and psychological counseling.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Descriptive evaluation furnished by project administrator, including formal and informal test scores, number of pupils served, and services provided; on-site observations with use of an observational checklist.

KEY FINDINGS

1968-1973 Observations indicated that the contracted services were received by the participating children. Specialized programs were implemented by the funded institutions. Individual reports by these institutions suggested that in all cases the specialized programs were successful in achieving their respective objectives. Those objectives (and methods of evaluation) varied considerably. One institution's project

report indicated that 70% of the reading pretest scores were at or below the level of IRI Book 1; posttest scores indicated that only 26% of the same pupils continued to read at or below that level. Another institution's report indicated that the average score on a phonics inventory increased by 15 points between the pretesting and posttesting periods.

1973-1974 This project enabled institutions for neglected and delinquent children to provide tutorial services, educational programs, and recreational/cultural activities to the pupils they serve. Test scores and observations indicated that gains were made in reading skills at several of the institutions. Recreational and cultural activities were implemented, providing "hands on" and other direct experiences with materials and sites of interest. Most programs were well planned and effectively implemented.

1974-1975 Three varied types of programs were scheduled for institutionalized children: academic tutoring, courses in human growth and development, and cultural enrichment experiences. Many of the institutions were unable to begin their programs when scheduled. At several institutions, however, tests indicated gains made in reading, mathematics, and other subject areas. Observations revealed that many programs, when instituted, were well planned and effectively implemented.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Funds were allocated to 20 institutions for participation in the Institutions for Neglected and Delinquent Children program during the current school year. Three of these institutions submitted proposals for regular-term activities, seven for both regular-term and summer activities, and eight for summer activities only. Budget allocations for institutions having regular-term activities ranged from $6,425 to $74,099 per institution.*

The institutions again experienced delays in program implementation for various reasons. As of December 4, nine of the 11 eligible regular-term institutions received approval for advanced payments for their proposed efforts. All of these institutions were expected to have implemented t eir programs by the beginning of the new year.

Data related to student achievement will again be provided by the individual institutions according to their needs and intentions. No attempt will be made to administer a single test or series of tests to all participants. Because of the variation in individual programs and the transiency of the participating students, such a testing program would provide questionable results.

Previous reports have reflected growth by participating children. It is expected that similiar growth will again be reported this year.

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Association for Jewish Children, 1301 Spencer Street, 19141; LI 9-9000
Baptist Children's House, 1300 South 58th Street, 19143; SA 9-6511
Catholic Home for Destitute Children, 6901 Woodland Avenue, 19142; SA 6-2605
Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, 311 South Juniper Street, 19107; KI 6-2990
Diagnostic Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, Chew Avenue & Church Lane, 19141; VI 8-4313, 6464
Franklin Village, 1823 Callowhill Street, 19130; MU 6-9700
Girard College, Girard & Corinthian Avenues, 19121; PO 5-7500
Guardian Angel Home, 8538 Frankford Avenue, 19136; MA 4-3794
Methodist Home for Children, Monument Road at Belmont Avenue, 19131; TR 7-1925
Morrell School for Girls, 5301 Chew Avenue, 19138; GE 8-3766
Northern Home for Children, 5301 Ridge Avenue, 19128; IV 2-1423
St. Joseph's Hall for Girls, 910 Church Lane, 19138; GE 8-9333
St. Vincent's Home for Children, 6900 Greenway Avenue, 19142; SA 4-0203, 3995
St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum of Tacony, 7201 Milnor Street, 19154; MA 4-5600
St. Vincent's Residence, 6901 Woodland Avenue, 19142; SA 7-8200
Salvation Army Children's Home, 4050 Conshohocken Avenue, 19131; TR 7-7214
Southern Home for Children, 3200 South Broad Street, 19145; DE 4-4319
Stenton Child Care Center, 6100 Stenton Avenue, 19138; MU 6-9700, Ext. 49311
Youth Services, Inc., 410 34th Street, 19104; BA 2-3262

Youth Development Center, 151 W. Luzerne Street, 19140; GL 7-4250 (USOE Grant #D-6376; included in this project's evaluation because of similarity of services provided)

LEARNING CENTERS

ADMINISTRATOR: Shively Willingham
HEADQUARTERS: Durham School
TELEPHONE: 732-3204
PBRS CODE: 611-02-541
OPERATING YEARS: 1966-1976
GRADES SERVED: PK-12
NO. OF PUPILS: 1,890
NO. OF SCHOOLS: 9
NO. OF EMPLOYEES: Professional 16, Paraprofessional 7, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET: Regular $366,525, Summer $13,000, Total $379,525
EVALUATION TEAM: Thomas J. Clark, Ethel K. Goldberg*, William F. Haggett

---

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Learning Centers project is currently comprised of two parts which provide services either to children directly, to teachers, to schools, or to the parent community. The project parts are held together by a common philosophy of individualizing instruction in a nonauthoritarian, richly stimulating environment.

Learning Center Laboratories are located in 10 Title I schools widely scattered throughout the city. Most of these are single rooms organized and equipped primarily to entice and engage children in applied mathematics, science, and logic through carefully selected learning aids, professional tools, games, and play activities from which discoveries can be made. These are organized and communicated (orally or in writing) under the direction of a specially trained teacher.

All teachers are in continuous in-service training; parents are prominent participants; older children teach younger ones; the children use the whole community as a resource; all learning is interrelated without fixed timetables; noncoercive respect replaces a multitude of rules; grades are replaced by individual child appraisal; goals are set by the individual child and the teacher cooperatively.

The Teacher-Parent Center, located at the Durham School, provides professional, paraprofessional, and parent skill-development sessions on released-time and volunteer-time bases. The T-P center conducts whole-day and half-day workshops on the making of educational aids and classrom facilities, and on open-classroom teaching and tutoring techniques. The main goal of the center is to help participants assume the roles of guides and motivators in providing a stimulating learning environment for their children.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Systematic observations of classroom atmosphere and behavior with use of an observational checklist; testing of pupil achievement in mathematics, problem solving, and language arts; surveys of attitude and behavior changes among T-P center participants.

KEY FINDINGS

1966-1973 Pupils attending LC showed better problem-solving ability than a comparison group. LC pupils were more goal-oriented, more able to cope with problems, and more able to produce a variety of solutions to open-ended problems.

Substantial progress was found to have been made in reading skills. A few children were judged to have equaled or surpassed the reading level found in the regular classes.

The existence and operation of the supplementary centers were supported by a substantial majority of the teachers whose pupils used them. Five of the six centers were directly related to the learning strategies furthered by the project and were seen to be of more potential value to classroom teachers than was realized because many times the teacher was not able to attend with her pupils.

1973-1974 The project's objective to have pupil attendance in the LC laboratories rank above their respective districts was met in three of eight laboratories during three sample months. In an additional study, however, LC laboratory attendance was found on the average to be greater than both total-school attendance and attendance of selected same-school comparison groups.

On the Language, Reading, and Mathematics subtests of the CAT-70, the project's objective to have the average LC pupil exceed the respective district average was met in 18 of 45 comparisons. Further investigation revealed that pupils in the two self-contained LC laboratories exceeded the district average in each comparison that was made.

1974-1975 The project was successful in having LC pupils exceed comparable nonparticipating pupils in problem-solving skills, mathematics-concept-formation skills, and oral and written communication skills. The finding that some former LC pupils performed less well in regular classrooms this year appeared to indicate a need for continued exposure to the LC environment.

The positive responses to the Teacher-Parent Center Survey and the large number of teachers, parents, paraprofessionals, and administrators who voluntarily sought assistance in the Teacher-Parent Center or the Learning Center Headquarters were interpreted as an indication of the success of these project components.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Observational and checklist data indicated that the Learning Centers project components are being implemented as intended. The mathematics laboratories have emphasized basic mathematics skills through a combination of drill-plus-reinforcement and discovery-oriented approaches. They have been successful in creating a planned learning atmosphere in which the project's mathematics-achievement objective will be met.*

Various communications-arts projects have been completed by communications laboratory pupils in preparation for their production of a successful TV documentary, another project objective.

The Teacher-Parent Center has created a growth-fostering environment through its multifaceted, individualized workshop program. Consequently, it is expected that long-term workshop attendance will foster changes in the behavior and attitudes of participants in the direction of more open, individualized, and noncoercive teaching, another goal of the project.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: McMichael, Rhoads
District 2: Douglass, Peirce
District 3: Jackson
District 4: Peirce, Wright
District 5: Clymer
District 6: Widener

MEET THE ARTIST

ADMINISTRATOR:	Jack Bookbinder
HEADQUARTERS:	Room 513, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7727
PBRS CODE:	611-02-513
OPERATING YEARS:	1974-1976
GRADES SERVED:	9-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	50
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	10
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 0, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 1
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $14,000, Summer $15,000, Total $29,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Joseph Meade

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Artist to Artist program, in cooperation with the Philadelphia Art Alliance, makes it possible for children from Title I schools who are talented in art to meet in seminars with America's distinguished painters and sculptors, on Friday afternoons, for 15 two-hour sessions.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Observations and follow-up interviews.

KEY FINDINGS

1974-1975 Both children and teachers participating in the Artist at Work program felt that children gained a deeper understanding of the field of art and artists. Teachers generally agreed that the program provided the children with an exposure to art and acted as a stimulus for the pursuit of additional art activities. Children also expressed a desire for more art explorations.

1975-1976 (Preliminary findings) In the absence of funding approval for the current year, the project was not yet operational as of February 20.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Bartram, University City, West Philadelphia
District 2: Franklin Sr. High, Franklin Learning Center, Penn
District 3: Bok, South Philadelphia
District 4: Dobbins, Gratz

MOTIVATION

ADMINISTRATOR:	Rebecca Segal
HEADQUARTERS:	Room 318, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7800
PBRS CODE:	611-04-555
OPERATING YEARS:	1966-1976
GRADES SERVED:	10-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	4,600
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	11
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 46, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 12
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $830,500, Summer $23,000, Total $853,500
EVALUATION TEAM:	Joseph Meade

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Participants are selected at the end of ninth grade. Then, each school week for the next three years, in regular classes or in after-school tutorials, they receive approximately 10 extra hours of a combination of English, mathematics, physical science, and social science courses. Also, they attend various concerts, art galleries, and plays.

In addition, the students receive counseling and psychological services to help them overcome emotional problems detrimental to academic achievement.

Because advancement of the student's emotional and academic performance can be hindered by problems at home, parents are involved in the program. They are told the reasons for their child's participation, encouraged to establish an atmosphere at home conducive to their child's education, and invited to participate in many of the after-school activities of the project.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Comparisons of gains in general English, mathematics, vocational aspirations, and educative abilities over the period of exposure.

KEY FINDINGS

1966-1973 Students in the project showed improvement in basic skills and a positive attitude toward going to college. It was reported that there was an increase in the number of students applying for and being accepted into college and that parental involvement was improved.

Students in the project achieved higher initial test scores (SCAT) than nonparticipating students. However, posttesting showed that very little gain was made over initial scores. Some students did show meaningful increases in language and arithmetic skills.

Participating students showed higher vocational aspirations than nonparticipants. The longer students participated in the program, the higher their vocational aspirations were likely to be.

Parents of Motivation students were involved in the program at every school. Each school provided some type of remedial tutoring, varying numbers of guest speakers, and curriculum enrichment either during or following the school day. While adhering to the general guidelines of the project, each school adapted the program to conform to its specific constraints and needs.

Tutoring in mathematics and English was available at all sites. Some schools expanded offerings to include history, science, and languages. Of 161 randomly selected students who were tutored at six schools, 82 (51%) improved their grades, 9 (6%) declined, and 70 (43%) showed no change.

1973-1974 A group of 95 tenth graders who were selected for the project but attended a non-Title-I school during FY 1973-1974 had an average grade-equivalent (GE) total Reading score of 9.6 on the California Achievement Tests. A similar group of students who participated in the Motivation project in 1973-1974 had an average GE of 10.1 on the same test. Motivation students achieved on the average one-half year better in reading than a similar group of nonparticipating students--a statistically significant difference.

1974-1975 Motivation graduates were attending post-high school programs in higher percentages than high school graduates nationwide. Motivation students were reading at a higher level than a comparable group of non-Motivation students, and their parents were pleased with the program. All teachers in the program who reported changes in attitude toward their students said they felt that their attitude had changed constructively.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Coordinators appear to be implementing the project according to the description in the Title I Application. The project's current operation is similar to that of past years. Students are taking extra classes, attending tutoring sessions, attending cultural events, and receiving extra counseling.*

The final evaluation depends upon information to be obtained in May.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Bartram, University City, West Philadelphia
District 2: Franklin Learning Center, Penn
District 3: Bok, South Philadelphia
District 4: Gratz, Strawberry Mansion
District 5: Edison, Kensington

MULTIMEDIA CENTER

ADMINISTRATOR:	Charles McLaughlin
HEADQUARTERS:	2901 W. Allegheny Avenue
TELEPHONE:	BA 5-1914
PBRS CODE:	611-06-615
OPERATING YEARS:	1968-1976
GRADES SERVED:	K-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	Nonpublic 9,063
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	48
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 1, Paraprofessional 2 Clerical 1
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $124,000, Summer $11,000, Total $135,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Thomas J. Clark, Ethel K. Goldberg, William F. Haggett*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Multimedia Center extends the capability of the members of the staff in many projects by providing them with materials and techniques that increase the reality of the concepts they are developing by the use of various combinations of materials with a multisensory approach. Materials include films, filmstrips, records, tapes, transparencies, etc., chosen on the basis of the objectives of each of the projects the center supports.

The center and its facilities are utilized by the staffs of Title I schools. In-service training is provided for paraprofessional aides and selected pupils where requested by school principals.

Software is housed in the center and is made available to all participating schools on a library-lending basis. Catalogs of available software and equipment are located in the participating schools. The center furnishes such supportive services for Title I projects as circulation of software among project staffs, provision of consumable audiovisual materials, repair and maintenance of equipment in the schools, and in-service training of aides and pupils.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Equipment checklist, teacher survey, and teacher and staff interviews.

KEY FINDINGS

1968-1973 In its first year, the project established relationships with participating elementary schools. The center was organized and lending procedures were established. Preliminary in-service courses were begun.

A survey of teachers, principals, and school coordinators during the project's fourth year revealed that MMC had established a reservoir of audiovisual materials related to the instructional needs of the pupils served. Highly positive ratings were attained by the project with respect to its in-service training program and supportive services considered prerequisite to the attainment of instructional goals.

The MMC circulated 1,643 pieces of equipment weekly, biweekly, monthly, or semiannually. Additionally, 1,813 pieces were housed permanently in 53 inner-city schools. The evaluation form, Assessment of Services, was completed by the principal of each of the 53 participating schools. The ratings generally ranged from good to superior on all aspects of the operation of the MMC.

1973-1974 Teachers in the participating schools appeared to make full use of the 1,719 items available for circulation. The records indicated that in addition to being circulated, materials were also being used by several teachers within individual schools. However, during the year, only approximately half of the 16,231 requests were filled as materials became available. This finding tends to indicate that if a greater number of the most frequently requested materials were stocked, more requests could be filled and greater integration of the materials in classroom instruction might be possible.

1974-1975 The average teacher used 44 materials to supplement or reinforce ongoing classroom instruction. However, only approximately 60% of the 13,177 requests were filled. It appeared that if a greater number of the most frequently requested materials or new and up-to-date materials were stocked, and longer circulation time for materials were available, teachers would be able to integrate these materials into their classroom instruction with greater efficiency and frequency.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Survey results and center records indicate that the Multimedia Center is meeting its objective of providing audiovisual and other instructional materials requested by the participating schools to meet the instructional needs of their pupils. The records also indicated that both paraprofessional aides and sixth-grade pupils have received training in the use of audiovisual hardware and other instructional materials.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Nonpublic: Archbishop Ryan, Cathedral, Corpus Christi, Gesu, Immaculate Conception A, Immaculate Conception B, Mercy Technical, Most

Blessed Sacrament, Most Precious Blood, Our Lady of Confidence, Our Lady of Holy Souls, Our Lady of Mercy, Our Lady of Rosary, Our Lady of Victory, Our Mother of Sorrows, Sacred Heart, St. Agatha, St. Anne, St. Anthony, St. Bonaventure, St. Boniface, St. Bridget, St. Carthage, St. Charles, St. Columba, St. Edward, St. Elizabeth, St. Francis de Sales, St. Francis Xavier, St. Gabriel, St. Gregory, St. Ignatius, St. Madeleine Sophie, St. Malachy, St. Mary Eternal, St Mary Interparochial, St. Michael, St. Paul, St. Peter Apostle, St. Peter Claver, St. Philip Neri, St. Rita, St. Rose of Lima, St. Stephen, St. Veronica, St. Vincent de Paul, Transfiguration, Visitation

OUT-OF-SCHOOL SEQUENCED SCIENCE EXPERIENCES

ADMINISTRATOR:	Fred M. Hofkin
HEADQUARTERS:	Room 319, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7771
PBRS CODE:	611-02-653
OPERATING YEARS:	1967-1976
GRADES SERVED:	6
NO. OF PUPILS:	Public 700, Nonpublic 420
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	29
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 0, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0 (Instructional personnel provided by Franklin Institute)
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $38,000, Summer None, Total $38,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Thomas J. Clark, Ethel K. Goldberg*, William F. Haggett

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A sixth-grade class of black public school children is paired with a sixth-grade class of black nonpublic or racially and ethnically mixed public or nonpublic school children for science experiences at the Franklin Institute, a community resource rich in facilities and equipment not available in their schools. The paired children meet for a full day per week for a six-week cycle. Each Tuesday through Friday, a different pair of schools participates; thus eight schools are involved per week, or 32 schools (and 32 teachers) in the four cycles per academic year. Parents are encouraged to participate in project activities.

The project is designed to promote the knowledge and understanding of selected basic concepts of biological and physical sciences as they pertain to our physical environment and use of energy. In addition, the project attempts to encourage interchange of ideas and building of cooperative work relationships between classmates of different races, national backgrounds, and religions. It is believed that this may help to decrease social isolation and promote understanding among children from different ethnic backgrounds.

Pupils engage in inquiry-based workshop activities and are encouraged to investigate basic science concepts related to air and water use and pollution, waste disposal, and energy production and consumption. These sessions are followed by a developmental period in which the children derive concepts and principles based on their workshop experience which they record on laboratory work sheets. Children have lunch together and travel to municipal installations in order to study their techniques for solving urban environmental problems.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Evaluation focuses on cognitive achievement (as indicated by pretest-to-posttest gains on the Science Achievement Test) and degree of socialization. Two observational checklists, completed during systematic monitoring, and a questionnaire are used to collect data on the attainment of goals in basic skills and social interaction.

KEY FINDINGS

1967-1973 Participating pupils obtained significantly higher scores on a science achievement test than nonparticipants. Low-ability participants consistently excelled their nonparticipating counterparts. No measurable differences in attitudes toward individuals of other ethnic and/or religious backgrounds were obtained.

The lessons, materials, and field trips occurred as planned. Constructive interaction between children from the paired schools was observed and the teachers felt that this was a valuable experience.

1973-1974 A six-category, 27-item, criterion-referenced science-mastery test was administered to pupils before and after their participation in the project. Their mean gain of 4.7 points from pretest to posttest indicated that this year, as in previous years, the project effectively communicated science information. Significant increases in pupil mastery of the separate subtests further substantiated the conclusion that the project had attained its objective of improving pupils' knowledge and understanding of some basic biological and physical science concepts.

Data regarding attitudes were gathered by means of two locally developed instruments: an observational checklist on pupil verbal and nonverbal social interaction, and a home-school teacher questionnaire. Evaluators found that 20 of the 25 observed pupils interacted with pupils from the paired (culturally different) school and that most of these interactions were positive. In 17 of 18 verbal interactions and in 19 of 29 nonverbal interactions, pupils worked cooperatively, openly expressing their feelings and accepting the feelings of others. Responses of the home-school teachers to questions pertaining to pupil involvement and interaction in project activities generally agreed with the evaluators' findings, namely, that the project was indeed fostering an active interchange of ideas and experiences and an attitude of cooperation between pupils of different ethnic backgrounds.

1974-1975 The project was well organized and fully implemented as planned. Its cognitive, social interaction, and basic skills objectives were attained.

The project resulted in a congregation of pupils from diverse ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds in the intellectually and experientially exciting atmosphere of the Franklin Institute to explore science, reinforce basic skills, and interact socially in a positive, cooperative way. The evaluator's observations of the project's smooth operation and judgments of its effectiveness in accomplishing its purposes were reinforced by positive test results and favorable reports by home-school teachers. Teachers almost unanimously praised the project's utilization of the unique features of the Franklin Institute to enrich and broaden their pupils' cognitive sociocultural horizons.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) Observational and questionnaire data indicate that the Out-of-School Sequenced Science Experiences project is being fully implemented to provide science, language-arts, and mathematics learning activities to interracially and interculturally paired sixth graders.*

The project presents evidence of attaining its science-achievement, social-interaction, and basic-skill-reinforcement objectives. Questionnaire and checklist items indicate that pupils are learning science and sharpening their basic skills. Social Interaction Observational Checklist data, evaluator observations, and home-school teacher responses reflect the success of task-oriented pairing of pupils from diverse racial, religious, and sociocultural backgrounds.

The average pupil attendance rate of approximately 97% is an indication of high pupil interest in and liking for the project.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: McMichael, Rhoads, Washington
District 2: Arthur, McDaniel, Stanton
District 3: Jackson, Spring Garden
District 4: Heston, Leidy, Wright
District 5: Dunbar, Sheppard, Welsh
District 6: Dobson, East Falls, Steel
District 7: Birney, Howe, McClure

Nonpublic: Cathedral, Gesu, Our Lady of Victory, St. Bridget, St. Carthage, St. Elizabeth, St. Malachy, Transfiguration, Visitation BVM

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY COORDINATOR

ADMINISTRATOR:	George Green
HEADQUARTERS:	Room B-3, Stevens School
TELEPHONE:	MA 7-1282
PBRS CODE:	611-17-505
OPERATING YEARS:	1966-1976
GRADES SERVED:	PK-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	Public 97,055 Nonpublic 9,000
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	140
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 16, Paraprofessional 183, Clerical 2
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $1,898,000, Summer $22,000, Total $1,920,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Arnold Escourt, Carrolyn Iwamoto, Fleta B. Waters*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The school-community coordinator (SCC) is a community resident who functions as a school staff member to provide better communication and understanding between the school and the community. One SCC is assigned to each elementary school and two to each secondary school to work with Title I students and their parents.

To achieve the project's goals, the SCC performs such activities as making home visits, telephoning, or writing letters to parents of Title I students, having in-school contacts with Title I students, encouraging Title I parents for involvement in and service to the school, planning and executing meetings for Title I parents and school personnel and community agencies related to school needs, informing the community of the school's Title I programs, informing the school staff of the concerns and needs of Title I students and their parents, and representing the school at community meetings relating to the needs of the Title I students at their school.

The SCC's work is performed under the direct supervision of an area coordinator (AC), also a community resident, who is assigned to a cluster of schools in a geographic area. The work of the AC is performed under the general direction of a project supervisor.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Surveys and questionnaires to SCCs, parents, principals, teachers, and others; case studies of SCCs and ACs.

KEY FINDINGS

1966-1973 In schools where the SCC concept was accepted, progress was made; where acceptance was lacking, progress and success seemed to be related to definition and communication of SCC's role.

Parents visited by the SCC became more knowledgeable about the school. Responses from school personnel and SCCs indicated that the primary role of the SCC should be to involve the community in school programs and affairs.

Community Resident Questionnaire indicated that 71% of the respondents had met with school-community coordinators; 83% of the respondents became more actively involved in community affairs as a result of contact with school-community coordinators; 63% felt that the school and community should have greater interaction. On a corresponding School Staff Questionnaire, 70% of the respondents indicated that they felt there was enough school-community participation. This difference in perception between school personnel and parents was indicative of a need for additional effort.

Direct observation of coordinators and interviews with principals, parents, and community workers indicated SCC to be one of the more successful ESEA Title I projects. The degree to which the project was successful depended largely on the school level. In most elementary schools the SCCs had become integral and necessary members of the school staffs, performing a vital role for both school and community. This was not quite the case in the junior and senior high schools. In a number of high schools (more senior than junior) the SCCs had not been able to establish themselves as community resource persons for all members of the faculty, nor had they been able to make significant headway in the community. This was due to the impersonal nature of the high school rather than to any lack of effort on the part of the coordinators. Modifications were needed for the project to be as effective in high schools as it had been in elementary schools.

1973-1974 The school-community coordinator provided a much needed service to the School District by acting as the communication link and interpreter between the school and the home. The SCC project was fully implemented and all of its stated objectives were achieved. The 202 SCCs were assigned to 153 Title I schools. The average SCC made 75 home visits per month, sponsored at least one cluster meeting per month for parents, attended all faculty meetings and at two or more of these meetings discussed the needs of the children and of the community, attended at least two community meetings per month to keep abreast of community needs, and developed at least one written communication per month to inform the community about school activities and to encourage its participation in these activities. The SCC also evaluated lunch-program applications to determine which children were eligible for free or reduced-price lunches in the school.

1974-1975 The average SCC made 78.4 home visits per month, sponsored at least 1.5 cluster meetings per month for parents, attended 90% of faculty meetings held, made 11 presentations at such meetings in regard to the needs of the children and of the community, attended 3.7 community meetings per month as the school's designated representative, and developed 1.8 written communications per month to inform the community about school activities and to encourage its participation in these activities. The SCC also frequently assisted parents in understanding and completing the forms for free and reduced-price school lunches when such services were requested.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The SCC project is currently organized to serve ESEA Title I students only. The SCCs are devoting specific attention to attendance, basic skills and work habits, behavior, health, and the general well-being of these students. This is verified by case studies, interviews, and examination of Request for Service forms, Report on Service forms, and monthly reports. In-school contacts with children are made by the SCCs.*

Area coordinators visit SCCs at least once a month and assist them by providing information, answering questions, and checking records. The ACs serve as a further key communication link between neighborhood schools, the community, and local organizations.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Barry, Bartram, Belmont, Bryant, Comegys, Daroff, Dunlap, Hamilton, Harrington, Holmes, Huey, Lea, Locke, Longstreth, McMichael, Mitchell, Morton, Powel, Rhoads, Sayre, Shaw, Sulzberger, Tilden, University City, Washington, West Philadelphia, Wilson, Wolf

District 2: Alcorn, Audenried, Bache, Barratt, Benson, Bregy, Carver, Childs. Darrah, Douglass, Franklin, Gideon, Kelley, McDaniel, Meade, Morris, Peirce, Penn, Poe, Reynolds, Sartain, Smith, Stanton, Vare, Vaux, Waring, Wayne

District 3: Bartlett, Bok, Furness, Hawthorne, Jackson, Jefferson, Kearny, Key, Kirkbride, Meredith, Nebinger, South Philadelphia, Southwark, Spring Garden, Stoddart-Fleisher, Vare, Washington, Wister

District 4: Blaine, Blankenburg, Cleveland, Dick, Dobbins, Duckrey, FitzSimons, Gillespie, Gratz, Hanna, Heston, Hill, Kenderton, Lehigh, Leidy, Peirce, Pratt-Arnold, Rhodes, Shoemaker, Stanton, Strawberry Mansion, Walton, Whittier, Wright

District 5: Brown, Clymer, Dunbar, Edison, Elverson, Fairhill, Ferguson, Hackett, Harrison, Hartranft, Hunter, Jones, Kensington, Ludlow, McKinley, Miller, Moffet, Penn Treaty, Potter-Thomas, Sheppard Stetson, Wanamaker, Welsh, Willard-Powers

District 6: Dobson, East Falls, Fulton, Kelly, Lingelbach, Logan, Mifflin, Pastorius, Pennell, Pickett, Roosevelt, Steel, Widener, Wister

District 7: Bethune, Pennsylvania Advancement, Smedley, Stearne, Taylor

SPEECH AND HEARING

ADMINISTRATOR:	Charles McLaughlin
HEADQUARTERS:	2901 W. Allegheny Avenue
TELEPHONE:	BA 5-3033
PBRS CODE:	611-06-720
OPERATING YEARS:	1969-1976
GRADES SERVED:	K-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	621 (Weekdays); 79 (Saturday Clinic)
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	47 (Weekdays); 8 (Saturday Clinic)
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 9, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $132,000, Summer None, Total $132,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	William E. Loue III, Judith Green Leibovitz, Lisbeth Sorkin

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Speech and Hearing project is designed to enable children with speech and hearing problems to function more effectively in the regular classroom. The project includes a weekday component and a Saturday clinic component.

In the weekday component, fully qualified speech therapists are assigned to groups of schools within the target area. From the school population each therapist selects children to participate according to the following priorities: (a) older and more severe cases; (b) younger children whose speech is unintelligible; (c) children with organic disorders (cleft palate, hearing loss, central nervous system disorder, etc.).

Each therapist is assigned a case load of approximately 100 children. The children are met in groups of 4 or 5 once or twice weekly for activities designed to correct individual defects. The sessions are approximately 30 minutes in length.

In the Saturday clinic component, clinics staffed by qualified therapists operate in various locations throughout the city. The program in each clinic operates under the following general plan: three one-hour periods between 9 a.m. and 12 noon for homogeneous groups of four pupils each, one half-hour period (12 to 12:30) for individual therapy, one half-hour clinical period (12:30 to 1 p.m.), and parent consulting included during each of the periods.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Templin-Darley Screening and Diagnostic Tests of Articulation, Defective Articulation Summary form, Stuttering Evaluation form, and tape recordings of speech samples.

KEY FINDINGS

1969-1973 End-of-year ratings of stuttering children showed that 72% had improved, 19% had remained the same, and 0.7% had regressed; 8.3% received no rating. Therapist ratings of defective articulation cases indicated 23% corrected, 5% dismissed as improved, 7% dropped, and 64% continued (99% total due to rounding). Therapist ratings of the stuttering cases showed 22% corrected, 27% dropped, and 51% continued. In each category of speech defects, the therapist ratings were beyond the expectations set by the project director.

1973-1974 The difference between mean pretest and posttest scores for each of eight therapist samples and the gain for the combined sample between the pretest and posttest were all found to be statistically significant at the .05 level. Thus the objective of correcting the defective sounds of project participants was attained.

On the project's Stuttering Evaluation form, the therapist's ratings showed an 80% improvement rate for project participants. Thus the objective of having a 70% improvement rate was exceeded.

Using the project's Defective Articulation Summary form and Stuttering Evaluation form, clinic therapists rated 30% of the defective articulation pupils and 23% of the stuttering pupils "corrected." Thus the objective of correcting 20% of the defective articulation children and 15% of the stuttering children was exceeded.

1974-1975 All but one of the project's stated objectives were attained: (a) defective sounds of children assigned for therapy were corrected; (b) the severity and/or incidences of stuttering behavior of pupils requiring therapy were decreased; (c) expected proportions of defectively articulating and stuttering pupils were dismissed as corrected; and (d) the general intelligibility aspects of connected speech patterns were improved for pupils receiving therapy. The project's objective dealing with the hearing-handicapped was not applicable to the current year's evaluation because of the lack of a hearing therapist.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The Speech and Hearing project has incorporated the Speech Therapy Clinics project as a second component of its operation. In the weekday component, six therapists have been assigned an appropriate case load of children with speech and hearing difficulties and are presently administering therapy as proposed in the Title I Application. Two therapist positions remain vacant.*

The Saturday clinic component, for children who are not able to receive the services of the weekday program, is functioning with one position vacant. It is expected that all project objectives will be attained by the end of the school year.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Nonpublic: (Weekdays) Ascension, Cathedral, Corpus Christi, Gesu, Hallahan, Holy Name, Immaculate Conception A, Maternity of BVM, Most Blessed Sacrament, Most Precious Blood, Nativity, Our Lady of Holy Souls, Our Lady of Ransom, Our Lady of Victory, Our Mother of Sorrows, Resurrection, Roman Catholic, Sacred Heart, St. Agatha, St. Ambrose, St. Anne, St. Bonaventure, St. Cecelia, St. Charles, St. Columba, St. Edward, St. Elizabeth, St. Francis de Sales, St. Francis Xavier, St. Gabriel, St. Gregory, St. Hugh, St. Ignatius, St. Joachim, St. Joan of Arc, St. Malachy, St. Martin of Tours, St. Mary Eternal, St. Matthew, St. Michael, St. Nicholas of Tolentine, St. Philip Neri, St. Rita, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Veronica, Transfiguration, Visitation

(Saturday Clinic) Good Shepherd, Our Lady of Rosary, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Henry, St. Jerome, St. John the Baptist, St. Monica, Stella Maris

SUMMER SPECIAL EDUCATION

ADMINISTRATOR:	Marechal-Neil E. Young
HEADQUARTERS:	1801 Market Street
TELEPHONE:	299-7248
PBRS CODE:	611-05-724
OPERATING YEARS:	1971-1976 (Summer 1976 not yet reportable)
GRADES SERVED:	K-12
NO. OF PUPILS:	800
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	6
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 0, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular None, Summer $134,000, Total $134,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Marion Kaplan, Larry Aniloff, Camilla Grigsby*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project is designed to safeguard academic and therapeutic gains made during the school year by special education pupils and to extend the job-coordinator service provided for retarded educable pupils.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Teacher reports of student progress, and on-site observations by project evaluators.

KEY FINDINGS

1971-1973 Data from the various summer programs indicated that all the pupils were involved in activities similar to the regular school program, thus preserving the continuity of the regular school instructional programs. In addition, the program for visually handicapped children emphasized activities not readily available during the regular school year.

The project was successful to a great degree in meeting its objectives. Pupils received cognitive and special skill instruction, and participated in a variety of trips and other activities not readily available during the regular school year.

1974 Teacher progress ratings of 330 students in academic skill areas indicated that 43% improved and 57% maintained their achievement level. Of 362 students rated in social skills, 43% improved and 55% maintained their level.

Of 158 orthopedically handicapped students, 103 received physiological therapy. Teacher ratings showed that 17% of the students improved and 83% maintained their achievement level.

A survey of all schools participating in the summer program found that, with the exception of the vocational programs for retarded trainable students which were patterned after actual work situations, students were taken on field trips, attended recreational activities such as the Children's Playhouse, and were often given the opportunity to pursue personal interests as part of their classroom program.

Eighty percent of the students assigned to summer jobs maintained employment throughout the summer. The summer job coordinator made 159 visits to various job sites for purposes of contacting the employers as well as meeting with the students.

1975

The Summer Special Education project offered exceptional students the option of continuing to receive the instructional and therapeutic services provided during the regular school year. Student progress reports indicated that all of the instructional and therapeutic programs were successful in maintaining and/or improving the students' levels in academic, social, and vocational skills and in physiological therapy. The inclusion of enrichment activities in the programs for the orthopedically handicapped, hearing-handicapped, visually handicapped, and emotionally disturbed provided additional benefits for participating students. Through the summer job coordinator service, the project successfully provided support to employed retarded educable students.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Hamilton (Brooks)
District 2: Martin
District 3: Bartlett
District 5: Muhr
District 6: Logan, Widener

WALNUT CENTER

ADMINISTRATOR:	Frances Becker
HEADQUARTERS:	Room B-14, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7934
PBRS CODE:	611-01-517
OPERATING YEARS:	1966-1976
GRADES SERVED:	PK-1
NO. OF PUPILS:	120
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	1
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 7, Paraprofessional 7, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $132,000, Summer $22,000, Total $154,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	William E. Loue III, Judith Green Leibovitz, Lisbeth Sorkin*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Walnut Center's organization provides the community with a choice of half-day preschool groups or full-day care. It also has two first grades and child care for school-age children beyond the first grade. A basic principle in reaching Walnut Center's objectives has been to maintain an ethnically and economically balanced population with emphasis on contributions of that diverse population.

Walnut Center's approach is an individualized one. The staff is aware of each child's assets and liabilities. The open classroom allows each child to develop his strengths and latent abilities through exploration, discovery, experimentation, and reinforcement of experience. The child is helped to develop a vital interlacing of skills, knowledge, and experience. Teachers are eclectic in their choice of methods, using a wide variety of materials, equipment, and books in mathematics, language arts, social studies, and science. Because of a fluidity of the center's organization, children have a continuity of experience from prekindergarten through first grade.

Active participation of parents, community volunteers, student teachers and high-school volunteers helps to individualize instruction by enhancing the classroom adult/pupil ratio. Volunteers participate in study, planning, and implementation workshops, while parents help in developing the broader educational goals.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Comparisons of progress in skill areas, using achievement tests, observations, and interviews.

KEY FINDINGS

1966-1973 WC pupils attained higher mental ability scores (Wechsler) than non-WC pupils. Readiness-test scores showed that the WC exposure

improved the readiness of kindergarten children for first grade. The WC program was well received by parents and teachers.

WC pupils, in general, scored significantly better than the non-WC pupils sampled in three areas of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. In verbal functioning, attention span, sensory concepts, and social isolation, they showed no appreciable gains over the year. Parental involvement tended to increase.

It was observed that WC children's adjustment to first grade was superior to that of children selected for comparison.

After the Walnut Center moved to a new building at 38th Street and Lancaster Avenue in 1970, its pupils continued to achieve at higher academic levels than did their peers in District 1 and the city. This was true for all groups at Walnut Center--kindergarten and first grade--in both language arts and mathematics. Many WC first-grade pupils were found to be reading at instructional Level 2. Although WC pupils from higher socioeconomic backgrounds performed on a higher level than their classmates from less privileged backgrounds, the progress of both groups was above that expected of children of the same age and grade. Pupil attitudes toward the school were highly favorable.

1973-1974 On the SESAT mathematics subtest in May 1974, the percentile rank of the average Walnut Center kindergarten pupil was 80, indicating performance superior to that of 80% of the pupils in the test's national norming population. In the letters- and-sounds subtest the average pupil's percentile rank was 78, indicating achievement superior to that of 78% of the pupils in the national norming population.

The first-grade children exceeded the objective set for the California Achievement Test (CAT I, Level A) administered in May 1974. In the mathematics-computation subtest the average pupil's percentile rank was 81 for one class and 94 for the other. In the concepts subtest the average pupil's percentile rank was 94 for one class and 95 for the other.

In the reading subtest, also, the Walnut Center pupils were outstanding. The average pupil's percentile rank in the vocabulary subtest was 98 for one class and 92 for the other. In the comprehension subtest, the average pupil's percentile rank was 98 for one class and 93 for the other.

1974-1975 The Walnut Center effectively provided a high-impact program for preschool and first-grade pupils in a racially and socioeconomically

mixed setting. A key community need for part-day and full-day child-care programs was met by providing children with services and experiences to aid their physical and intellectual growth. With its pupils achieving at exceptionally high levels, Walnut Center continued to serve as an effective urban model of early childhood education.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The Walnut Center project appears to be operating efficiently. Food, health, and social services are being provided to the satisfaction of the acting head teacher. It would appear that the successful implementation and planning of the WC staff will lead to the attainment of the project's stated objectives.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Walnut Center

YOUNG AUDIENCES

ADMINISTRATOR:	Edwin Heilakka
HEADQUARTERS:	Room 316, 21st Street and Parkway
TELEPHONE:	299-7807
PBRS CODE:	611-02-514
OPERATING YEARS:	1974-1976
GRADES SERVED:	2-8
NO. OF PUPILS:	Public 1,000, Nonpublic 240
NO. OF SCHOOLS:	9
NO. OF EMPLOYEES:	Professional 0, Paraprofessional 0, Clerical 0
CURRENT BUDGET:	Regular $20,000, Summer None, Total $20,000
EVALUATION TEAM:	Arnold Escourt, Carrolyn Iwamoto, Fleta B. Waters*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Young Audiences project consists of a series of six musical lessons presented in Title I schools by professional musicians chosen and trained in Young Audiences techniques by project advisers and directors. Printed vocabularies, repertoires, brief descriptions of performing ensembles, and suggested preparatory and follow-up lessons are sent to the school for use in classroom preparation and reinforcement. The concerts are programmed to bring participating Title-I-eligible pupils into close contact with professional musicians, their instruments, their music, and basic musical concepts.

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

An observational checklist is used by evaluators during their visits to the programs. Staff questionnaires are used to ascertain program effectiveness and impact. The Young Audiences Assessment form is administered as a pretest and as a posttest.

KEY FINDINGS

1974-1975 The Young Audiences project provided musical presentations of at least 45-minute duration to children in Grades 1-12 in selected target-area schools. Both children and teachers were receptive to the programs. Children expressed pleasure in participating actively with the artists and felt their knowledge was increased as a result of the subject and the format of the programs presented. Teachers recognized the children's need for such exposure to unfamiliar styles of music and instruments and, in turn, planned to schedule follow-up activities.

1975-1976 *(Preliminary findings) The Young Audiences project began operation in December after revisions were made in the already existing project. This year an effort was made to have eligible children in selected Title I schools observe six correlated programs about different phases of music instead of only one or two isolated shows.*

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

District 1: Comegys
District 2: Childs, Kane
District 3: Meredith
District 4: Walton
District 5: Carroll, Moffet
District 6: Lingelbach
District 7: Birney

APPENDIX

PROJECTS NO LONGER FUNDED UNDER TITLE I

Project	Year of Termination
Academically Able Students	1969
Action	1974
Afro-American History	1974
Apparel Industry Training	1973
Art Specialist Teachers	1974
Class for Mentally Retarded, Emotionally Disturbed Children	1974
Closed-Circuit Television	1973
College Placement	1974
Communications Experiences	1975
Counselor Aides	1974
Cultural Experiences	1974
Dual-Audio Television	1972
Educational Technology	1966
Enrichment Activities for Hearing-Impaired Pupils	1975
Experimental Center for Young Children	1966
French and Spanish Program	1967
Germantown Area Schools	1973
Human Relations Retreats	1974
Instructional Management	1974
Intensive Learning Center	1975
Itinerant Hearing Service	1975
Learning Dimensions	1973
Music Specialist Teachers	1974
New Staffing Patterns	1973
Pennsylvania Advancement School	1975
Philadelphia Tutorial Project	1970
Primesite	1969
Puerto Rican Orientation	1974
Reading Enrichment and Development	1975
Relationship Confrontation Cluster	1969
Salable Vocational Skills	1969
Science Improvement	1973
Special Mathematics	1973
Special Services for Bussed Children	1969
Stanton Project	1969
Summer Adventures in Learning	1975
Summer Schools	1967
Team Teaching	1967
Understanding	1972
Young Great Society	1968
Youth Serving Youth	1974